

Course-Section: AMST 100 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 55
 FEB 13, 2008
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	814/1639	4.36	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1090/1639	4.20	4.31	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	697/1583	4.35	4.47	4.19	4.01	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	236/1532	4.44	4.38	4.01	3.88	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	544/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	3.78	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.08	4.31	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.03	4.55	4.65	4.56	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	569/1579	4.19	4.40	4.08	3.95	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.38	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.98	4.90	4.70	4.61	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	800/1517	4.49	4.49	4.27	4.20	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1550	3.79	3.80	4.22	4.17	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	398/1295	4.49	4.30	3.94	3.84	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	770/1398	4.20	4.45	4.07	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	4.89	4.61	4.30	4.07	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 100 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 56
 FEB 13, 2008
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	814/1639	4.36	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1090/1639	4.20	4.31	4.22	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	697/1583	4.35	4.47	4.19	4.01	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	236/1532	4.44	4.38	4.01	3.88	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	544/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	3.78	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1044/1612	4.08	4.31	4.16	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.03	4.55	4.65	4.56	4.00
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	3.79	3.80	4.22	4.17	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	770/1398	4.20	4.45	4.07	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	4.89	4.61	4.30	4.07	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 100 0201
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 57
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	740/1639	4.36	4.41	4.27	4.08	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	415/1639	4.20	4.31	4.22	4.17	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	722/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.18	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	625/1583	4.35	4.47	4.19	4.01	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	7	10	4.00	774/1532	4.44	4.38	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	9	13	4.46	429/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	3.78	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	13	4.25	814/1612	4.08	4.31	4.16	4.10	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	20	3	4.08	1462/1635	4.03	4.55	4.65	4.56	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	2	10	6	4.05	859/1579	4.19	4.40	4.08	3.95	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	454/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.38	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	273/1520	4.98	4.90	4.70	4.61	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	417/1517	4.49	4.49	4.27	4.20	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	414/1550	3.79	3.80	4.22	4.17	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	191/1295	4.49	4.30	3.94	3.84	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	369/1398	4.20	4.45	4.07	3.85	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	489/1391	4.89	4.61	4.30	4.07	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	496/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.01	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	4	2	1	3	3.09	834/ 958	3.09	4.14	3.93	3.71	3.09

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 58
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	518/1639	4.76	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	425/1639	4.64	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	661/1397	4.44	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	476/1583	4.63	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	419/1532	4.48	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	404/1504	4.47	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	376/1612	4.54	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1311/1635	4.65	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.55	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	561/1518	4.77	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	674/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	371/1517	4.77	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	351/1550	3.57	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	1	6	11	4.25	459/1295	4.38	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	260/1398	4.72	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	525/1391	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	631/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	296/ 958	4.18	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 58
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 59
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	4	16	4.59	518/1639	4.76	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	425/1639	4.64	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	661/1397	4.44	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	476/1583	4.63	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	419/1532	4.48	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	404/1504	4.47	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	376/1612	4.54	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1311/1635	4.65	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.30
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	1	1	6	0	1	0	2.13	1516/1550	3.57	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	4.38	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	260/1398	4.72	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	525/1391	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	631/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	296/ 958	4.18	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 59
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0201
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 60
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1639	4.76	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	316/1639	4.64	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	574/1397	4.44	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583	4.63	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532	4.48	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	416/1504	4.47	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	546/1612	4.54	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.65	4.55	4.65	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	473/1579	4.55	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	301/1518	4.77	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	206/1517	4.77	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	139/1550	3.57	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	265/1295	4.38	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	309/1398	4.72	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	4.38	710/1391	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	375/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	456/ 958	4.18	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 200 0201
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 60
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0201
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 61
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1639	4.76	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	316/1639	4.64	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	574/1397	4.44	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.46
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1583	4.63	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	317/1532	4.48	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	416/1504	4.47	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	546/1612	4.54	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.65	4.55	4.65	4.63	5.00
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	4	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/1550	3.57	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	309/1398	4.72	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	4.38	710/1391	4.50	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	375/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.77
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	456/ 958	4.18	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 200 0201
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 61
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 222 0101
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: KING, PAULA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 62
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	780/1639	4.41	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	7	14	4.26	859/1639	4.40	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	758/1397	4.22	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	500/1583	4.51	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	4	6	11	4.04	744/1532	4.26	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	8	11	4.25	612/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	2	5	15	4.38	669/1612	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	1023/1635	4.68	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	11	10	4.29	612/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	877/1518	4.50	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	648/1520	4.88	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	547/1517	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	0	2	4	15	4.45	703/1550	4.04	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	3	3	5	10	3.91	731/1295	4.30	4.30	3.94	4.07	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	511/1398	4.56	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	471/1391	4.65	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	533/1388	4.70	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	554/ 958	4.01	4.14	3.93	4.00	3.85
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

26 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 21 **** **** 4.52 3.00 ****

Course-Section: AMST 222 0101
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: KING, PAULA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 62
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 222 0101
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 63
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	780/1639	4.41	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	7	14	4.26	859/1639	4.40	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	9	13	4.30	758/1397	4.22	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	17	4.48	500/1583	4.51	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	4	6	11	4.04	744/1532	4.26	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	8	11	4.25	612/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	2	5	15	4.38	669/1612	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	6	18	4.64	1023/1635	4.68	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.29
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	4.88	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1517	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	20	4	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/1550	4.04	3.80	4.22	4.33	3.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	4.30	4.30	3.94	4.07	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	511/1398	4.56	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	471/1391	4.65	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	533/1388	4.70	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	2	4	9	5	3.85	554/ 958	4.01	4.14	3.93	4.00	3.85
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 222 0101
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 63
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 222 0201
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 64
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	11	16	4.34	806/1639	4.41	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.34
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	15	15	4.41	684/1639	4.40	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	6	12	12	4.13	916/1397	4.22	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	17	14	4.38	640/1583	4.51	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	20	4.44	409/1532	4.26	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	12	15	4.28	585/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	11	16	4.28	779/1612	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	943/1635	4.68	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	13	16	4.55	332/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	13	18	4.58	708/1518	4.50	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	382/1520	4.88	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	18	13	4.42	713/1517	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	24	4.66	468/1550	4.04	3.80	4.22	4.33	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	5	13	11	4.21	497/1295	4.30	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	12	19	4.56	391/1398	4.56	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	8	21	4.56	572/1391	4.65	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	286/1388	4.70	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	2	7	13	9	3.94	508/ 958	4.01	4.14	3.93	4.00	3.94
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	3.24	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	4.33	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 222 0201
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 64
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	3	A	10	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 222 0301
 Title INTRO MEDIA STUDIES
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 65
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	582/1639	4.41	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	316/1639	4.40	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	888/1397	4.22	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	299/1583	4.51	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	335/1532	4.26	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	202/1504	4.38	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	490/1612	4.38	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1635	4.68	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	332/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	863/1518	4.50	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	699/1520	4.88	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	462/1517	4.53	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	424/1550	4.04	3.80	4.22	4.33	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	129/1295	4.30	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	194/1398	4.56	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	462/1391	4.65	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	459/1388	4.70	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	260/ 958	4.01	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.42
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	2.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 290 0101
 Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 66
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	726/1639	4.43	4.41	4.27	4.35	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.27	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	795/1397	4.25	4.38	4.28	4.39	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	616/1532	4.21	4.38	4.01	4.09	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	260/1504	4.64	4.41	4.05	4.09	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	837/1612	4.23	4.31	4.16	4.21	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1114/1635	4.54	4.55	4.65	4.63	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.40	4.08	4.14	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.58	4.43	4.48	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.90	4.70	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	0	8	4.27	882/1550	4.27	3.80	4.22	4.33	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	313/1295	4.44	4.30	3.94	4.07	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.45	4.07	4.14	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	423/1388	4.73	4.65	4.28	4.37	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	179/ 958	4.60	4.14	3.93	4.00	4.60
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 303 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 67
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	6	6	7	3.76	1352/1639	3.76	4.41	4.27	4.28	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	11	4	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	9	8	4.10	939/1583	4.10	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	0	5	10	3.90	911/1532	3.90	4.38	4.01	4.05	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	5	10	3.95	884/1504	3.95	4.41	4.05	4.12	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1273/1612	3.76	4.31	4.16	4.12	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	1195/1635	4.45	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	4	9	2	3.53	1308/1579	3.53	4.40	4.08	4.07	3.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	5	5	7	3.79	1357/1518	3.79	4.58	4.43	4.39	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	571/1520	4.89	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	4	9	3	3.53	1339/1517	3.53	4.49	4.27	4.23	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	6	5	5	3.35	1380/1550	2.39	3.80	4.22	4.20	2.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	6	2	4	0	1	2.08	1272/1295	2.08	4.30	3.94	3.95	2.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	4	2	7	3.63	1059/1398	3.63	4.45	4.07	4.13	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	5	1	8	3.94	1040/1391	3.94	4.61	4.30	4.35	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	828/1388	4.26	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	558/ 958	3.85	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.85
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 303 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 67
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 303 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 68
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	6	6	7	3.76	1352/1639	3.76	4.41	4.27	4.28	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	11	4	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	9	8	4.10	939/1583	4.10	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	0	5	10	3.90	911/1532	3.90	4.38	4.01	4.05	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	5	10	3.95	884/1504	3.95	4.41	4.05	4.12	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1273/1612	3.76	4.31	4.16	4.12	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	1195/1635	4.45	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.45
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1550	2.39	3.80	4.22	4.20	2.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	4	2	7	3.63	1059/1398	3.63	4.45	4.07	4.13	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	5	1	8	3.94	1040/1391	3.94	4.61	4.30	4.35	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	828/1388	4.26	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	558/ 958	3.85	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.85
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 303 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 69
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	6	6	7	3.76	1352/1639	3.76	4.41	4.27	4.28	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	11	4	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	9	8	4.10	939/1583	4.10	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	0	5	10	3.90	911/1532	3.90	4.38	4.01	4.05	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	1	5	10	3.95	884/1504	3.95	4.41	4.05	4.12	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	7	7	3.76	1273/1612	3.76	4.31	4.16	4.12	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	1195/1635	4.45	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.45
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	4.89	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	4	0	6	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	2.39	3.80	4.22	4.20	2.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	4	2	7	3.63	1059/1398	3.63	4.45	4.07	4.13	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	5	1	8	3.94	1040/1391	3.94	4.61	4.30	4.35	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	828/1388	4.26	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	4	3	5	3.85	558/ 958	3.85	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.85
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Age Group	Count	Score Range	Count	Category	Count	Requirement	Count	Level	Count	Requirement	Count
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 70
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	508/1639	4.54	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	517/1639	4.45	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	517/1397	4.52	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	371/1583	4.57	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	178/1532	4.67	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	291/1504	4.52	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	5	15	4.35	706/1612	4.39	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	968/1635	4.40	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	538/1579	4.38	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	616/1518	4.45	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1520	4.91	4.90	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	523/1517	4.35	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	1	2	18	4.23	912/1550	3.38	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	289/1295	4.18	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	349/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	356/1391	4.84	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	496/1388	4.74	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	****/ 958	****	4.14	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	27	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 71
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	508/1639	4.54	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	17	4.50	517/1639	4.45	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	517/1397	4.52	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	371/1583	4.57	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	178/1532	4.67	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	291/1504	4.52	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	5	15	4.35	706/1612	4.39	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	968/1635	4.40	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.69
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	6	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	****/1550	3.38	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	349/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	356/1391	4.84	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	496/1388	4.74	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	****/ 958	****	4.14	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	5
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 310 0201
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: SABIO, INGRID
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 72
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	14	4.43	712/1639	4.54	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	14	4.35	761/1639	4.45	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	467/1397	4.52	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	455/1583	4.57	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	17	4.52	323/1532	4.67	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	537/1504	4.52	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	6	15	4.48	532/1612	4.39	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	7	13	3	3.83	1581/1635	4.40	4.55	4.65	4.66	3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	517/1579	4.38	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	3	2	14	4.24	1110/1518	4.45	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	776/1520	4.91	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	0	5	13	4.14	999/1517	4.35	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	5	11	3.91	1161/1550	3.38	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	753/1295	4.18	4.30	3.94	3.95	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	183/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.87
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	159/1391	4.84	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	255/1388	4.74	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	8	10	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 958	****	4.14	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 320 0101
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 73
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	14	15	4.29	850/1639	4.29	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	12	17	4.32	787/1639	4.32	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	24	4.53	497/1397	4.53	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	10	21	4.58	402/1583	4.58	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	5	7	16	4.03	751/1532	4.03	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	9	20	4.42	466/1504	4.42	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	9	18	4.30	756/1612	4.30	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	15	17	4.48	1155/1635	4.48	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.48
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	11	15	4.52	372/1579	4.52	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	6	22	4.69	575/1518	4.69	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	9	20	4.63	1074/1520	4.63	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	10	17	4.47	648/1517	4.47	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	11	17	4.42	755/1550	4.42	3.80	4.22	4.20	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	2	7	20	4.53	251/1295	4.53	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	6	5	9	4.05	756/1398	4.05	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	2	9	9	4.24	831/1391	4.24	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	693/1388	4.45	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	2	6	5	7	3.85	554/ 958	3.85	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.85
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 320 0101
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 73
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	9	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	11	C	4	General	14	Under-grad	34	Non-major	24
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 322 0101
 Title AMER SOCY & CULT IN FI
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 74
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	7	11	4.04	1117/1639	4.04	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	12	9	3.96	1158/1639	3.96	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1175/1397	3.75	4.38	4.28	4.26	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	10	13	4.31	741/1583	4.31	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	10	9	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	632/1612	4.40	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	8	18	4.56	1101/1635	4.56	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	6	11	5	3.95	972/1579	3.95	4.40	4.08	4.07	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	1061/1518	4.29	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	597/1520	4.88	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	9	11	4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	6	8	9	3.81	1215/1550	3.81	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	109/1295	4.80	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	5	10	4.21	660/1398	4.21	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	356/1391	4.79	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	509/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	****/ 958	****	4.14	3.93	3.97	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 322 0101
 Title AMER SOCY & CULT IN FI
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 74
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	9	Under-grad	27	Non-major	17
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 325 0101
 Title STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 75
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	12	11	4.21	929/1639	4.21	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	9	14	4.37	722/1639	4.37	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	7	18	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	19	4.54	444/1583	4.54	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	441/1532	4.41	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	8	15	4.37	514/1504	4.37	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	398/1612	4.59	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	0	8	17	4.54	1114/1635	4.54	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	14	8	4.30	601/1579	4.30	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	10	16	4.56	745/1518	4.56	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	699/1520	4.85	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	8	15	4.41	726/1517	4.41	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	11	14	4.44	716/1550	4.44	3.80	4.22	4.20	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	155/1295	4.71	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	708/1398	4.14	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	670/1391	4.43	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	578/1388	4.59	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.59
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	4.14	3.93	3.97	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 325 0101
 Title STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 75
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: AMST 357 0101
 Title SP TOPICS:COMM,MEDIA,A
 Instructor: SNYDER, DONALD (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 76
 FEB 13, 2008
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	8	12	11	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	10	12	3.91	1262/1639	3.91	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	4	1	5	7	3.72	1190/1397	3.72	4.38	4.28	4.26	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	2	13	13	4.09	946/1583	4.09	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	13	8	3.77	1023/1532	3.77	4.38	4.01	4.05	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	7	11	11	4.03	807/1504	4.03	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	3	5	17	3.97	1096/1612	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.12	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	21	9	4.19	1402/1635	4.19	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	3	16	6	4.12	806/1579	4.12	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	4	1	13	13	4.13	1189/1518	4.13	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	4	12	13	4.09	1030/1517	4.09	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	4	11	14	4.13	1010/1550	3.21	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	3	9	15	4.06	595/1295	4.06	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	3	7	14	3.97	816/1398	3.97	4.45	4.07	4.13	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	6	7	14	4.10	936/1391	4.10	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	5	6	18	4.37	764/1388	4.37	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	3	0	11	6	6	3.46	742/ 958	3.46	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.46
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	21	Under-grad	33	Non-major	29
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	11	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 357 0101
 Title SP TOPICS:COMM,MEDIA,A
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 77
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	8	12	11	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	10	12	3.91	1262/1639	3.91	4.31	4.22	4.20	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	1	4	1	5	7	3.72	1190/1397	3.72	4.38	4.28	4.26	3.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	4	2	13	13	4.09	946/1583	4.09	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	13	8	3.77	1023/1532	3.77	4.38	4.01	4.05	3.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	7	11	11	4.03	807/1504	4.03	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	3	5	17	3.97	1096/1612	3.97	4.31	4.16	4.12	3.97
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	21	9	4.19	1402/1635	4.19	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1579	4.12	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	31	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1518	4.13	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1520	4.75	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	26	2	0	4	0	1	0	2.40	****/1550	3.21	3.80	4.22	4.20	3.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	3	7	14	3.97	816/1398	3.97	4.45	4.07	4.13	3.97
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	6	7	14	4.10	936/1391	4.10	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	5	6	18	4.37	764/1388	4.37	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.37
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	3	0	11	6	6	3.46	742/ 958	3.46	4.14	3.93	3.97	3.46
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	21	Under-grad	33	Non-major	29
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	11	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 380 0101
 Title COMMUNITY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 78
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	6	20	4.59	529/1639	4.59	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	20	4.66	360/1639	4.66	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	350/1397	4.69	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	4	19	4.46	524/1583	4.46	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	137/1532	4.83	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	275/1504	4.62	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	18	4.45	575/1612	4.45	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	22	4.79	840/1635	4.79	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	25	4.76	454/1518	4.76	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	382/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	23	4.69	382/1517	4.69	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	26	4.83	265/1550	4.83	3.80	4.22	4.20	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	6	19	4.57	234/1295	4.57	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	349/1398	4.64	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	550/1391	4.59	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	509/1388	4.65	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	2	3	4	11	4.20	380/ 958	4.20	4.14	3.93	3.97	4.20
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	****	4.45	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 380 0101
 Title COMMUNITY IN AMERICA
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 78
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: AMST 391 0101
 Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 79
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	754/1639	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	486/1639	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1397	4.71	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	260/1583	4.80	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	190/1532	4.73	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	416/1504	4.60	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	913/1635	4.63	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	496/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	629/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	648/1517	4.66	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	638/1550	4.68	3.80	4.22	4.20	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	197/1295	4.68	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	145/1398	4.92	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1391	4.77	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	296/1388	4.85	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	190/ 958	4.50	4.14	3.93	3.97	4.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.50	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.59	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.65	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.08	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****

Course-Section: AMST 391 0101
 Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 79
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 391 0201
 Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 80
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	430/1639	4.53	4.41	4.27	4.28	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	199/1639	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.20	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	4.71	4.38	4.28	4.26	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	160/1583	4.80	4.47	4.19	4.24	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	190/1532	4.73	4.38	4.01	4.05	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	195/1504	4.60	4.41	4.05	4.12	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.31	4.16	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1114/1635	4.63	4.55	4.65	4.66	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	352/1579	4.47	4.40	4.08	4.07	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	397/1518	4.71	4.58	4.43	4.39	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.93	4.90	4.70	4.68	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	198/1517	4.66	4.49	4.27	4.23	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	231/1550	4.68	3.80	4.22	4.20	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	155/1295	4.68	4.30	3.94	3.95	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	129/1398	4.92	4.45	4.07	4.13	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	356/1391	4.77	4.61	4.30	4.35	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1388	4.85	4.65	4.28	4.34	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	240/ 958	4.50	4.14	3.93	3.97	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 420 0101
 Title SEMINAR:COMM/MEDIA/ART
 Instructor: SCHALLER, THOMA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 81
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	404/1639	4.69	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	141/1532	4.81	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	7	5	3.88	1198/1612	3.88	4.31	4.16	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.55	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	167/1579	4.88	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	301/1518	4.86	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	371/1517	4.78	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	139/1550	4.79	3.80	4.22	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	135/1295	4.73	4.30	3.94	4.01	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	294/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.61	4.30	4.48	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	771/1388	4.36	4.65	4.28	4.50	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	75/ 958	4.91	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 420 0101
 Title SEMINAR:COMM/MEDIA/ART
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 82
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	404/1639	4.69	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	141/1532	4.81	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	7	5	3.88	1198/1612	3.88	4.31	4.16	4.18	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.55	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1579	4.88	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.86	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.78	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	457/1550	4.79	3.80	4.22	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	155/1295	4.73	4.30	3.94	4.01	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	294/1398	4.71	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.61	4.30	4.48	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	771/1388	4.36	4.65	4.28	4.50	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	75/ 958	4.91	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.91
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.50	4.52	4.49	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.00	4.47	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	2.50	4.16	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PAT (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 83
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	615/1639	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	859/1639	4.50	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	792/1583	4.43	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	335/1532	4.60	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1504	4.85	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1612	4.93	4.31	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1135/1635	4.67	4.55	4.65	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	241/1579	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.90	4.58	4.43	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.90	4.90	4.70	4.75	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	886/1517	4.63	4.49	4.27	4.34	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1198/1550	3.83	3.80	4.22	4.24	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	265/1295	3.75	4.30	3.94	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	329/1398	4.78	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.61	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	296/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.50	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.83	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	58/ 80	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.59	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	79/ 82	2.50	2.50	4.16	4.02	2.50
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 84
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	615/1639	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	859/1639	4.50	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	792/1583	4.43	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	335/1532	4.60	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1504	4.85	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1612	4.93	4.31	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1135/1635	4.67	4.55	4.65	4.72	4.50

Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1550	3.83	3.80	4.22	4.24	3.25

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	329/1398	4.78	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.61	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	296/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.50	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.75

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.83	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82	4.50	4.50	4.52	4.49	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	58/ 80	4.00	4.00	4.47	4.59	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	79/ 82	2.50	2.50	4.16	4.02	2.50

Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.85	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	8
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: AMST 490 0102
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, DUNCA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 85
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	4.50	4.31	4.22	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	4.78	4.38	4.28	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1583	4.43	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1532	4.60	4.38	4.01	4.07	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.85	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.93	4.31	4.16	4.18	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	4.67	4.55	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	4.90	4.58	4.43	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	4.90	4.90	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.63	4.49	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1550	3.83	3.80	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.75	4.30	3.94	4.01	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	4.78	4.45	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.61	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	4.89	4.65	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	4.75	4.14	3.93	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 495 0301
 Title HONORS SEMINAR IN AMST
 Instructor: BELASCO, WARREN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 86
 FEB 13, 2008
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.41	4.27	4.42	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.31	4.22	4.29	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.38	4.28	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.31	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	965/1532	3.83	4.38	4.01	4.07	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	701/1504	4.17	4.41	4.05	4.20	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1229/1612	3.83	4.31	4.16	4.18	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.55	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.40	4.08	4.21	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	****	4.58	4.43	4.51	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.90	4.70	4.75	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1517	****	4.49	4.27	4.34	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1550	****	3.80	4.22	4.24	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.45	4.07	4.23	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.61	4.30	4.48	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.65	4.28	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.14	3.93	4.24	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant