

Course-Section: AMST 100 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: Snyder, D
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 28
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	2	1	18	6	3.83	1212/1481	3.83	4.34	4.29	4.14	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	16	6	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.30	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	773/1249	4.21	4.45	4.27	4.14	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	10	13	4.17	829/1424	4.17	4.43	4.21	4.06	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	13	13	4.31	451/1396	4.31	4.36	3.98	3.89	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	13	10	4.03	737/1342	4.03	4.47	4.07	3.88	4.03	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	287/1459	4.66	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	20	8	4.29	1193/1480	4.29	4.53	4.68	4.64	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	6	15	3	3.88	997/1450	3.88	4.27	4.09	3.97	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	12	13	4.36	946/1409	4.36	4.57	4.42	4.36	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	522/1407	4.89	4.91	4.69	4.57	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	15	10	4.25	828/1399	4.25	4.57	4.26	4.23	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	8	14	4.21	898/1400	4.21	4.58	4.27	4.19	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	8	7	10	4.08	563/1179	4.08	4.22	3.96	3.85	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	9	12	4.15	638/1262	4.15	4.51	4.05	3.77	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	461/1259	4.65	4.65	4.29	4.06	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	345/1256	4.77	4.76	4.30	4.08	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	18	0	2	3	3	0	3.13	707/ 788	3.13	4.04	4.00	3.80	3.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

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	1	3	7	15	4.14	967/1481	4.14	4.34	4.29	4.40	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	17	4.32	747/1481	4.32	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	2	5	15	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	485/1424	4.46	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	23	4.64	209/1396	4.64	4.36	3.98	3.94	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	18	4.39	414/1342	4.39	4.47	4.07	4.05	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	7	15	4.42	580/1459	4.42	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	3	18	6	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.53	4.68	4.68	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	1	14	8	4.17	722/1450	4.17	4.27	4.09	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	4	19	4.44	839/1409	4.44	4.57	4.42	4.47	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.91	4.69	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	4	17	4.42	659/1399	4.42	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	4	20	4.56	541/1400	4.56	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	526/1179	4.14	4.22	3.96	4.05	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	220/1262	4.74	4.51	4.05	4.11	4.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	615/1259	4.47	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	532/1256	4.58	4.76	4.30	4.28	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	358/ 788	4.13	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.75	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.17	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: AMST 200 0201
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JANE
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 29
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	28	Non-major	26
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 200H 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 30
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	9	8	4.39	698/1481	4.39	4.34	4.29	4.40	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	5	5	3.78	1194/1481	3.78	4.30	4.23	4.29	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1249	****	4.45	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	545/1424	4.41	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	102/1396	4.83	4.36	3.98	3.94	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	4	7	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.47	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	6	6	1	3.17	1356/1459	3.17	4.26	4.16	4.17	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	3	4.17	1281/1480	4.17	4.53	4.68	4.68	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.27	4.09	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	1049/1409	4.22	4.57	4.42	4.47	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.91	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	671/1399	4.41	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	890/1400	4.22	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.22	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	76/1262	4.94	4.51	4.05	4.11	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	127/1259	4.94	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	335/ 788	4.17	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 18 Non-major 14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 15	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 2		

Course-Section: AMST 222 0101
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 31
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	14	4.39	688/1481	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.40	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	13	8	4.26	811/1481	4.19	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	334/1249	4.43	4.45	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	473/1424	4.52	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	201/1396	4.60	4.36	3.98	3.94	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	333/1342	4.52	4.47	4.07	4.05	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	9	6	6	3.70	1187/1459	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.17	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	19	1	3.91	1412/1480	4.02	4.53	4.68	4.68	3.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	494/1450	4.36	4.27	4.09	4.15	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	13	6	4.14	1104/1409	4.26	4.57	4.42	4.47	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	450/1407	4.96	4.91	4.69	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	11	11	4.43	648/1399	4.55	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	571/1400	4.70	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	7	8	4	3.75	793/1179	3.77	4.22	3.96	4.05	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	345/1262	4.68	4.51	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	516/1259	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	248/1256	4.93	4.76	4.30	4.28	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	13	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	564/ 788	3.63	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 222 0201
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 32
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	749/1481	4.36	4.34	4.29	4.40	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	950/1481	4.19	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	788/1249	4.43	4.45	4.27	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	375/1424	4.52	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	269/1396	4.60	4.36	3.98	3.94	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	270/1342	4.52	4.47	4.07	4.05	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	9	4	3.78	1142/1459	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.17	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	13	3	4.12	1316/1480	4.02	4.53	4.68	4.68	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	546/1450	4.36	4.27	4.09	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	10	4.39	913/1409	4.26	4.57	4.42	4.47	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.91	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	376/1399	4.55	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	166/1400	4.70	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	773/1179	3.77	4.22	3.96	4.05	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	142/1262	4.68	4.51	4.05	4.11	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	304/1259	4.70	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1256	4.93	4.76	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	584/ 788	3.63	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.75	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.17	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 290 0101
 Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 33
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	6	4.38	698/1481	4.38	4.34	4.29	4.40	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	682/1481	4.38	4.30	4.23	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1249	****	4.45	4.27	4.36	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	326/1424	4.62	4.43	4.21	4.28	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	662/1396	4.08	4.36	3.98	3.94	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	166/1342	4.69	4.47	4.07	4.05	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	924/1459	4.08	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1158/1480	4.33	4.53	4.68	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.27	4.09	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	1031/1409	4.25	4.57	4.42	4.47	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.91	4.69	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	376/1399	4.67	4.57	4.26	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.58	4.27	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	3	2	3	4	3.67	840/1179	3.67	4.22	3.96	4.05	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.51	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.76	4.30	4.28	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.75	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.17	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 34
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	8	11	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	11	7	3.88	1136/1481	3.88	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	788/1249	4.20	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	5	5	13	4.35	633/1424	4.35	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	185/1396	4.68	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	13	4.48	323/1342	4.48	4.47	4.07	4.12	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	1	7	13	4.45	535/1459	4.45	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	6	4.24	1230/1480	4.24	4.53	4.68	4.65	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	13	5	4.10	786/1450	4.10	4.27	4.09	4.10	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	739/1409	4.52	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	636/1407	4.84	4.91	4.69	4.67	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	11	11	4.32	763/1399	4.32	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	444/1400	4.64	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	4	7	9	4.10	560/1179	4.10	4.22	3.96	4.02	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	289/1262	4.61	4.51	4.05	4.14	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	391/1259	4.72	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.76	4.30	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	11	2	0	0	3	2	3.43	640/ 788	3.43	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.75	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.17	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 34
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	9	Under-grad	25	Non-major	17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 320 0101
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 35
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	15	15	4.17	938/1481	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	28	4.69	299/1481	4.64	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	190/1249	4.41	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	13	20	4.53	416/1424	4.63	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	12	16	4.11	633/1396	4.23	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	10	20	4.29	519/1342	4.45	4.47	4.07	4.12	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	8	22	4.47	505/1459	4.44	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.53	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	15	11	4.37	504/1450	4.42	4.27	4.09	4.10	4.37	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	5	26	4.65	588/1409	4.70	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	6	26	4.73	880/1407	4.84	4.91	4.69	4.67	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	22	4.65	404/1399	4.66	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	3	26	4.64	456/1400	4.64	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	147/1179	4.79	4.22	3.96	4.02	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	5	10	6	3.91	797/1262	4.34	4.51	4.05	4.14	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	1	7	12	4.23	803/1259	4.36	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	2	0	2	17	4.45	625/1256	4.62	4.76	4.30	4.34	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	287/ 788	4.23	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 7	C 0	General 13	Under-grad 35 Non-major 29
84-150	19	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 320 8020
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 36
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	729/1481	4.26	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	399/1481	4.64	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	893/1249	4.41	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	240/1424	4.63	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	11	4.35	419/1396	4.23	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	230/1342	4.45	4.47	4.07	4.12	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	611/1459	4.44	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	421/1480	4.98	4.53	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	389/1450	4.42	4.27	4.09	4.10	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	417/1409	4.70	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	300/1407	4.84	4.91	4.69	4.67	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	349/1399	4.66	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	433/1400	4.64	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	99/1179	4.79	4.22	3.96	4.02	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	190/1262	4.34	4.51	4.05	4.14	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	588/1259	4.36	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	332/1256	4.62	4.76	4.30	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	318/ 788	4.23	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 322 0101
 Title AMER SOCY & CULT IN FI
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 37
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	4	5	11	4.09	1012/1481	4.09	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	3	7	8	3.86	1142/1481	3.86	4.30	4.23	4.23	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	4	5	9	3.95	1023/1424	3.95	4.43	4.21	4.27	3.95	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	3	12	4.14	613/1396	4.14	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	1	4	13	4.29	519/1342	4.29	4.47	4.07	4.12	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	6	12	4.18	836/1459	4.18	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	702/1480	4.91	4.53	4.68	4.65	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	10	4	3.84	1022/1450	3.84	4.27	4.09	4.10	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	865/1409	4.43	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.91	4.69	4.67	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	0	7	12	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	2	14	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	129/1179	4.76	4.22	3.96	4.02	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	4	11	4.20	610/1262	4.20	4.51	4.05	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	358/1259	4.75	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.76	4.30	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	14	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 23 Non-major 19
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 2		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 1		

Course-Section: AMST 357A 0101
 Title KILLER FICTIONS
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 38
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	9	19	4.52	540/1481	4.52	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	21	4.58	422/1481	4.58	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	647/1249	4.38	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	334/1424	4.60	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	6	18	4.33	435/1396	4.33	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	21	4.55	277/1342	4.55	4.47	4.07	4.12	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	448/1459	4.52	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	23	7	4.19	1260/1480	4.19	4.53	4.68	4.65	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	304/1450	4.54	4.27	4.09	4.10	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	217/1409	4.89	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.91	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	267/1399	4.75	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	166/1400	4.89	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	70/1179	4.93	4.22	3.96	4.02	4.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	228/1262	4.72	4.51	4.05	4.14	4.72	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	391/1259	4.72	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	332/1256	4.78	4.76	4.30	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	324/ 788	4.18	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.18	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.75	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.17	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: AMST 357A 0101
 Title KILLER FICTIONS
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 38
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	21	Under-grad	31	Non-major	15
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 357B 0101
 Title THE ROAD MOVIE
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 39
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	20	4.64	417/1481	4.64	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	671/1481	4.39	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	695/1249	4.32	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	16	4.46	485/1424	4.46	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	8	3	17	4.32	443/1396	4.32	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	11	13	4.32	484/1342	4.32	4.47	4.07	4.12	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	10	12	4.07	924/1459	4.07	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	18	4.64	966/1480	4.64	4.53	4.68	4.65	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	266/1450	4.59	4.27	4.09	4.10	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	334/1409	4.81	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	545/1407	4.88	4.91	4.69	4.67	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	404/1399	4.64	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	521/1400	4.58	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	162/1179	4.69	4.22	3.96	4.02	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	7	11	4.26	563/1262	4.26	4.51	4.05	4.14	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	461/1259	4.65	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	428/1256	4.70	4.76	4.30	4.34	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	477/ 788	3.92	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.92	

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	4	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	6	28	4.65	417/1481	4.65	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	24	4.55	458/1481	4.55	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.28	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	6	25	4.47	473/1424	4.47	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	10	27	4.63	217/1396	4.63	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	11	25	4.65	206/1342	4.65	4.47	4.07	4.12	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3	30	4.68	264/1459	4.68	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.53	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	16	11	4.27	620/1450	4.27	4.27	4.09	4.10	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	8	25	4.76	417/1409	4.76	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.91	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	234/1399	4.79	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	312/1400	4.76	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	157/1179	4.71	4.22	3.96	4.02	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	7	14	4.55	325/1262	4.55	4.51	4.05	4.14	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	106/1259	4.95	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	216/1256	4.91	4.76	4.30	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	1	0	3	5	8	4.12	364/ 788	4.12	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.12	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.75	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.17	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: AMST 372 0101
 Title AMERICAN FOOD
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 40
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	24	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	19	Under-grad	38	Non-major	26
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: AMST 392 0101
 Title STUDIES IN AMER SOCIET
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 41
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	16	15	4.41	678/1481	4.38	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	12	15	4.28	790/1481	4.44	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	639/1249	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	13	17	4.41	557/1424	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	9	21	4.61	233/1396	4.69	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	10	16	4.40	405/1342	4.53	4.47	4.07	4.12	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	11	15	4.32	707/1459	4.39	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1480	4.98	4.53	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	15	6	4.13	761/1450	4.14	4.27	4.09	4.10	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	383/1409	4.82	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	500/1407	4.90	4.91	4.69	4.67	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	21	4.58	480/1399	4.70	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	8	20	4.48	613/1400	4.60	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	4	12	12	4.13	533/1179	3.97	4.22	3.96	4.02	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	5	17	4.46	381/1262	4.39	4.51	4.05	4.14	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	1	25	4.85	257/1259	4.66	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	332/1256	4.68	4.76	4.30	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	1	9	13	4.38	233/ 788	4.22	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.75	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.17	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: AMST 392 0101
 Title STUDIES IN AMER SOCIET
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 41
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	32	Non-major	20
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 392 0201
 Title STUDIES IN AMER SOCIET
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 42
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	718/1481	4.38	4.34	4.29	4.29	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	410/1481	4.44	4.30	4.23	4.23	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	393/1249	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	344/1424	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.27	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	131/1396	4.69	4.36	3.98	4.00	4.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	198/1342	4.53	4.47	4.07	4.12	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	550/1459	4.39	4.26	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	351/1480	4.98	4.53	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	732/1450	4.14	4.27	4.09	4.10	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	261/1409	4.82	4.57	4.42	4.43	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	500/1407	4.90	4.91	4.69	4.67	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	212/1399	4.70	4.57	4.26	4.27	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	361/1400	4.60	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	0	3	6	8	3.80	760/1179	3.97	4.22	3.96	4.02	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	527/1262	4.39	4.51	4.05	4.14	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	615/1259	4.66	4.65	4.29	4.34	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	532/1256	4.68	4.76	4.30	4.34	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	1	1	7	7	4.06	382/ 788	4.22	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.06	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	5.00	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.75	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.75	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.42	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.17	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: AMST 392 0201
 Title STUDIES IN AMER SOCIET
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 42
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PAT
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 43
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	4.42	665/1481	4.46	4.34	4.29	4.45	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	736/1481	4.42	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1249	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	818/1424	4.24	4.43	4.21	4.35	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	1330/1396	3.58	4.36	3.98	4.09	2.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	112/1342	4.78	4.47	4.07	4.21	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	402/1459	4.53	4.26	4.16	4.25	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1114/1480	4.62	4.53	4.68	4.74	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	662/1450	4.22	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.57	4.42	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	4.88	4.91	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1399	4.65	4.57	4.26	4.36	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1400	4.63	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1179	3.43	4.22	3.96	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1262	4.67	4.51	4.05	4.33	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1259	4.56	4.65	4.29	4.57	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1256	4.56	4.76	4.30	4.60	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 788	4.17	4.04	4.00	4.26	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	36/ 69	4.75	4.75	4.53	4.64	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	31/ 63	4.75	4.75	4.44	4.49	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	45/ 69	4.42	4.42	4.35	4.53	4.17	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	44/ 68	4.17	4.17	3.92	4.10	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 490 0201
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 44
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1481	4.46	4.34	4.29	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	517/1481	4.42	4.30	4.23	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.44	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	684/1424	4.24	4.43	4.21	4.35	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	484/1396	3.58	4.36	3.98	4.09	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	135/1342	4.78	4.47	4.07	4.21	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	460/1459	4.53	4.26	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	797/1480	4.62	4.53	4.68	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	662/1450	4.22	4.27	4.09	4.28	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.57	4.42	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	823/1407	4.88	4.91	4.69	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	567/1399	4.65	4.57	4.26	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	591/1400	4.63	4.58	4.27	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	934/1179	3.43	4.22	3.96	4.07	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.51	4.05	4.33	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	548/1259	4.56	4.65	4.29	4.57	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	543/1256	4.56	4.76	4.30	4.60	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	335/ 788	4.17	4.04	4.00	4.26	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 69	4.75	4.75	4.53	4.64	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 63	4.75	4.75	4.44	4.49	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/ 69	4.42	4.42	4.35	4.53	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	25/ 68	4.17	4.17	3.92	4.10	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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