

Course-Section: AMST 100 0101
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 34
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	595/1576	4.23	4.41	4.30	4.11	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	20	4.59	502/1576	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	21	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	406/1342	4.51	4.51	4.32	4.19	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	6	20	4.47	579/1520	4.37	4.50	4.25	4.09	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	17	4.43	468/1465	4.34	4.44	4.12	4.02	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	353/1434	4.34	4.44	4.14	3.94	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	5	5	18	4.46	592/1547	4.32	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	23	6	4.17	1386/1574	4.46	4.41	4.64	4.59	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	8	16	4.48	422/1554	4.28	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	8	21	4.72	568/1488	4.55	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	390/1493	4.76	4.87	4.73	4.65	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	339/1486	4.53	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	378/1489	4.42	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	4	5	19	4.54	293/1277	4.16	4.18	4.03	3.91	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	543/1279	4.41	4.67	4.17	3.96	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	401/1270	4.65	4.76	4.35	4.09	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	299/1269	4.71	4.77	4.35	4.09	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	221/ 878	4.54	4.28	4.05	3.91	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 1 Major 5
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 29 Non-major 25
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	12	10	3.93	1213/1576	4.23	4.41	4.30	4.11	3.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	798/1576	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	17	4.34	761/1342	4.51	4.51	4.32	4.19	4.34
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	9	14	4.28	837/1520	4.37	4.50	4.25	4.09	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	6	15	4.25	647/1465	4.34	4.44	4.12	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	9	12	4.10	836/1434	4.34	4.44	4.14	3.94	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	6	5	15	4.18	916/1547	4.32	4.34	4.19	4.10	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	758/1574	4.46	4.41	4.64	4.59	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	15	8	4.07	886/1554	4.28	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	11	13	4.37	1018/1488	4.55	4.66	4.47	4.41	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	1133/1493	4.76	4.87	4.73	4.65	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	929/1486	4.53	4.63	4.32	4.26	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	8	13	4.07	1080/1489	4.42	4.61	4.32	4.22	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	1	4	5	10	3.78	869/1277	4.16	4.18	4.03	3.91	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	554/1279	4.41	4.67	4.17	3.96	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	612/1270	4.65	4.76	4.35	4.09	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	626/1269	4.71	4.77	4.35	4.09	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	193/ 878	4.54	4.28	4.05	3.91	4.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.86	****

Course-Section: AMST 100 0201
 Title IDEAS/IMAGES:AMER CULT
 Instructor: CRASE, KIRSTEN
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 35
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: BHALLA, TAMARA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 36
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	3	4	12	4.24	976/1576	4.04	4.41	4.30	4.35	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	7	8	4.00	1138/1576	3.92	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	879/1342	4.24	4.51	4.32	4.41	4.20		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	4	2	4	10	4.00	1041/1520	4.12	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	483/1465	4.36	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	4	11	4.19	748/1434	4.00	4.44	4.14	4.06	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	8	4	8	3.90	1145/1547	4.11	4.34	4.19	4.22	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	1	18	1	3.86	1529/1574	3.96	4.41	4.64	4.62	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	1074/1554	3.96	4.38	4.10	4.05	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	9	8	4.15	1176/1488	4.15	4.66	4.47	4.44	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	1125/1493	4.69	4.87	4.73	4.75	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	7	8	4.10	1069/1486	4.03	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	696/1489	4.27	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	2	3	4	6	3.59	983/1277	3.65	4.18	4.03	4.01	3.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.61	4.67	4.17	4.14	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	605/1270	4.53	4.76	4.35	4.30	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	559/1269	4.65	4.77	4.35	4.29	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	355/ 878	4.14	4.28	4.05	3.92	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: AMST 200 0101
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: BHALLA, TAMARA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 36
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 200 0201
 Title MULTICULTURAL AMERICA
 Instructor: BHALLA, TAMARA
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 37
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	6	8	12	3.83	1299/1576	4.04	4.41	4.30	4.35	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	8	12	3.83	1275/1576	3.92	4.45	4.27	4.32	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	1	10	15	4.28	819/1342	4.24	4.51	4.32	4.41	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	5	5	17	4.24	869/1520	4.12	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	18	4.30	596/1465	4.36	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	11	9	3.80	1063/1434	4.00	4.44	4.14	4.06	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	7	17	4.31	774/1547	4.11	4.34	4.19	4.22	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	24	4	4.07	1438/1574	3.96	4.41	4.64	4.62	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	2	0	3	11	10	4.04	908/1554	3.96	4.38	4.10	4.05	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	4	0	8	15	4.14	1181/1488	4.15	4.66	4.47	4.44	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	3	24	4.79	849/1493	4.69	4.87	4.73	4.75	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	3	9	12	3.96	1139/1486	4.03	4.63	4.32	4.29	3.96	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	5	15	4.04	1102/1489	4.27	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	0	5	9	7	3.71	923/1277	3.65	4.18	4.03	4.01	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	432/1279	4.61	4.67	4.17	4.14	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	5	0	16	4.52	620/1270	4.53	4.76	4.35	4.30	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	1	17	4.67	535/1269	4.65	4.77	4.35	4.29	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	5	5	7	4.00	464/ 878	4.14	4.28	4.05	3.92	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors	9
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 2		

Course-Section: AMST 290 0101
 Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 38
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	457/1576	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.35	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	313/1576	4.65	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.51	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	197/1520	4.83	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	284/1465	4.75	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	323/1434	4.66	4.44	4.14	4.06	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1329/1547	4.19	4.34	4.19	4.22	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	957/1574	4.57	4.41	4.64	4.62	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	363/1554	4.63	4.38	4.10	4.05	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	786/1488	4.64	4.66	4.47	4.44	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	4.93	4.87	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	792/1486	4.64	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	623/1277	4.21	4.18	4.03	4.01	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.90	4.67	4.17	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.90	4.76	4.35	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.80	4.77	4.35	4.29	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	367/ 878	4.63	4.28	4.05	3.92	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	4
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	9				
			? 0						

Course-Section: AMST 290 0201
 Title APPROACH IN AMER STUDI
 Instructor: BRYAN, KATHY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 39
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	541/1576	4.60	4.41	4.30	4.35	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	515/1576	4.65	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1342	****	4.51	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1520	4.83	4.50	4.25	4.26	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	148/1465	4.75	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	226/1434	4.66	4.44	4.14	4.06	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	167/1547	4.19	4.34	4.19	4.22	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1079/1574	4.57	4.41	4.64	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.63	4.38	4.10	4.05	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1488	4.64	4.66	4.47	4.44	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	683/1493	4.93	4.87	4.73	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.64	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.31	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	506/1277	4.21	4.18	4.03	4.01	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	4.90	4.67	4.17	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	4.90	4.76	4.35	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	4.80	4.77	4.35	4.29	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	4.63	4.28	4.05	3.92	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 40
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	7	19	4.43	742/1576	4.57	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	17	4.37	811/1576	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	263/1342	4.68	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	320/1520	4.68	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	244/1465	4.60	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	21	4.60	323/1434	4.63	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	17	4.47	592/1547	4.43	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	606/1574	4.87	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	12	12	4.38	558/1554	4.34	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	652/1488	4.79	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	223/1493	4.98	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	619/1486	4.72	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	602/1489	4.46	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	84/1277	4.74	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	381/1279	4.80	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	307/1270	4.87	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	167/1269	4.98	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	350/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****

Course-Section: AMST 310 0101
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 40
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	8				
			? 0						

Course-Section: AMST 310 8620
 Title GENDER AND INEQUALITY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 41
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	373/1576	4.57	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	891/1576	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	510/1342	4.68	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	339/1520	4.68	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	366/1465	4.60	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	270/1434	4.63	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	690/1547	4.43	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.87	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	682/1554	4.34	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	248/1488	4.79	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	4.98	4.87	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.72	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	888/1489	4.46	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	283/1277	4.74	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	4.80	4.67	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.87	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	4.98	4.77	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.88	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 320 0101
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 42
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	772/1576	4.42	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	555/1576	4.58	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	357/1342	4.73	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	18	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	8	10	3.96	919/1465	4.06	4.44	4.12	4.09	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	12	4.29	636/1434	4.32	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	527/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	10	11	4.52	1063/1574	4.57	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	672/1554	4.37	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	708/1488	4.70	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	1133/1493	4.75	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	545/1486	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	500/1489	4.73	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	132/1277	4.71	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	244/1279	4.73	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	4.92	4.76	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	4.94	4.77	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	164/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 9	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 8
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	7	D 0	Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 17
				Electives	0
#### - Means there are not enough					

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	8	
?	0			

Course-Section: AMST 320 0201
 Title TV IN AMERICAN CULTURE
 Instructor: HUMMEL, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 43
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	9	23	4.43	742/1576	4.42	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	25	4.62	448/1576	4.58	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	310/1342	4.73	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	8	26	4.64	367/1520	4.63	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	6	7	20	4.16	738/1465	4.06	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	12	20	4.35	574/1434	4.32	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	10	22	4.43	641/1547	4.47	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	23	4.62	972/1574	4.57	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	11	14	4.44	477/1554	4.37	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	505/1488	4.70	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	30	4.91	557/1493	4.75	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	5	25	4.72	393/1486	4.67	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	336/1489	4.73	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	243/1277	4.71	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.62	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	327/1279	4.73	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	317/1270	4.92	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	299/1269	4.94	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	221/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 10	C 1	General 18	Under-grad 37 Non-major 34
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 1		

Course-Section: AMST 325 0101
 Title STUDIES IN POPULAR CUL
 Instructor: KING, PAULA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 44
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	2	3	22	4.61	500/1576	4.61	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	263/1342	4.79	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	169/1465	4.81	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	21	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	249/1547	4.74	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	187/1554	4.76	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	325/1486	4.76	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	240/1489	4.86	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	154/1277	4.76	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	118/1279	4.93	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	182/1270	4.93	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	194/1269	4.93	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	210/ 878	4.53	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.53

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 9	Under-grad 28 Non-major 22
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 6	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 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 350 0101
 Title CRITICAL DECADES
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, DUNCA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 45
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	9	10	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	7	9	4.20	996/1576	4.20	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	696/1342	4.41	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	4	11	4.14	758/1465	4.14	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	704/1434	4.24	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	900/1547	4.19	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	813/1574	4.72	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	10	8	4.25	712/1554	4.25	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	846/1488	4.53	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	0	2	15	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	596/1486	4.58	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	5	12	4.42	789/1489	4.42	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	1	6	1	6	3.35	1080/1277	3.35	4.18	4.03	4.11	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	751/1279	4.13	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	467/1269	4.73	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	735/ 878	3.43	4.28	4.05	4.09	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 12	Under-grad 22 Non-major 20
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 355 0101
 Title SPEC TOPIC:CULTURAL PL
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 46
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	30	4.63	457/1576	4.63	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	15	18	4.22	978/1576	4.22	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	28	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	4	10	23	4.51	499/1520	4.51	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.51	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	9	29	4.63	284/1465	4.63	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	13	22	4.37	564/1434	4.37	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	7	12	19	4.15	939/1547	4.15	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	36	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	9	24	4.68	255/1554	4.68	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	15	22	4.47	907/1488	4.48	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	167/1493	4.97	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	12	24	4.54	642/1486	4.54	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	8	26	4.54	660/1489	4.54	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	8	28	4.63	236/1277	4.63	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	6	24	4.61	381/1279	4.61	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	5	26	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	4	27	4.73	479/1269	4.73	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	23	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.28	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: AMST 355 0101
 Title SPEC TOPIC:CULTURAL PL
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 70
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 46
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	22	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	19	Under-grad	41	Non-major	38
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	1						

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	7	9	4.47	682/1576	4.47	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	743/1576	4.41	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1155/1342	3.70	4.51	4.32	4.30	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	4	6	3.69	1152/1465	3.69	4.44	4.12	4.09	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	287/1434	4.64	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	3	8	3.88	1167/1547	3.88	4.34	4.19	4.21	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	547/1574	4.87	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	463/1554	4.45	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	774/1488	4.58	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	501/1493	4.92	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	602/1489	4.58	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	997/1277	3.56	4.18	4.03	4.11	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.91	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1269	4.82	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/ 878	4.91	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.91
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: AMST 357A 0101
 Title THEORIES: MEDIA/CULTUR
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 48
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	277/1576	4.78	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	201/1576	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	221/1342	4.83	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	297/1465	4.61	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	469/1547	4.56	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	10	3	3.89	1525/1574	3.89	4.41	4.64	4.61	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	331/1554	4.58	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1493	4.94	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	187/1277	4.71	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: AMST 357A 0101
 Title THEORIES: MEDIA/CULTUR
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 48
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 357B 0101
 Title: SPORTS AND MEDIA
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 49
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	637/1576	4.44	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	581/1576	4.46	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	583/1342	4.31	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	348/1520	4.57	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	483/1465	4.32	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	296/1434	4.59	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	9	10	4.53	503/1547	4.43	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	8	10	2	3.70	1543/1574	3.57	4.41	4.64	4.61	3.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	339/1554	4.37	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	694/1488	4.48	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1493	4.84	4.87	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	201/1486	4.79	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	297/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	309/1277	4.36	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	312/1279	4.66	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	317/1270	4.65	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	409/1269	4.30	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	538/ 878	3.71	4.28	4.05	4.09	3.92	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	7				
			? 0						

Course-Section: AMST 357B 0201
 Title: SPORTS AND MEDIA
 Instructor: MOFFITT, KIMBER
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 50
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	808/1576	4.44	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	785/1576	4.46	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	931/1342	4.31	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	511/1520	4.57	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	678/1465	4.32	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	360/1434	4.59	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	11	4.33	755/1547	4.43	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	7	7	2	3.44	1560/1574	3.57	4.41	4.64	4.61	3.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	805/1554	4.37	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	1064/1488	4.48	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	1029/1493	4.84	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	393/1486	4.79	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	579/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	569/1277	4.36	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	358/1279	4.66	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	686/1270	4.65	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	0	2	6	3.82	1015/1269	4.30	4.77	4.35	4.41	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	709/ 878	3.71	4.28	4.05	4.09	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 388 0101
 Title LANDSCAPE & CULTURE
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 51
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	527/1576	4.59	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	448/1576	4.62	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	251/1342	4.79	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	453/1520	4.55	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	22	4.59	316/1465	4.59	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	9	16	4.43	498/1434	4.43	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	434/1547	4.59	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	13	10	4.19	772/1554	4.19	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	680/1488	4.66	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	223/1493	4.97	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	619/1486	4.55	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	19	4.45	766/1489	4.45	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	4	3	5	16	4.18	600/1277	4.18	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	532/1279	4.42	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	378/1270	4.79	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	467/1269	4.74	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 391 0101
 Title STUDIES IN AMERICAN CU
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, DUNCA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 52
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	882/1576	4.31	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	528/1576	4.56	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	631/1520	4.44	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	137/1465	4.88	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	554/1434	4.38	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	641/1547	4.44	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	645/1574	4.81	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	532/1554	4.40	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	173/1488	4.94	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	784/1493	4.81	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	136/1489	4.94	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	660/1277	4.08	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	381/1279	4.60	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	559/1270	4.60	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	194/1269	4.93	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.28	4.05	4.09	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
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 392 0101
 Title: STUDIES IN AMER SOCIET
 Instructor: ORSER, EDWARD W
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 53
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	11	17	4.45	712/1576	4.45	4.41	4.30	4.30	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	19	4.48	638/1576	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.51	4.32	4.30	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.50	4.25	4.25	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	23	4.72	225/1465	4.72	4.44	4.12	4.09	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	360/1434	4.55	4.44	4.14	4.15	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	5	6	16	4.24	849/1547	4.24	4.34	4.19	4.21	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	17	12	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.41	4.64	4.61	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	17	9	4.18	794/1554	4.18	4.38	4.10	4.09	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.66	4.47	4.47	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.87	4.73	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	9	17	4.54	642/1486	4.54	4.63	4.32	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	6	21	4.68	487/1489	4.68	4.61	4.32	4.34	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	4	13	10	4.14	623/1277	4.14	4.18	4.03	4.11	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	432/1279	4.52	4.67	4.17	4.20	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.76	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.77	4.35	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	2	2	4	4	7	3.63	679/ 878	3.63	4.28	4.05	4.09	3.63	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	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	26				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 410 0101
 Title SEMINAR:CMTY & DIVERSI
 Instructor: BHALLA, TAMARA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 54
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	2	7	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.41	4.30	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	510/1342	4.57	4.51	4.32	4.46	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.44	4.12	4.22	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.44	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1288/1574	4.30	4.41	4.64	4.69	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.66	4.47	4.55	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.78	4.87	4.73	4.80	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	619/1486	4.56	4.63	4.32	4.41	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.18	4.03	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1279	4.88	4.67	4.17	4.31	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.88	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.88	4.77	4.35	4.55	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	4.28	4.05	4.33	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.44	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.89	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.56	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.53	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.53	4.01	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 55
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1241/1576	4.20	4.41	4.30	4.46	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	759/1576	4.32	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	925/1342	4.13	4.51	4.32	4.46	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	921/1520	4.35	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	513/1465	4.20	4.44	4.12	4.22	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	625/1434	4.40	4.44	4.14	4.30	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	690/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1424/1574	4.18	4.41	4.64	4.69	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554	4.50	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	589/1488	4.86	4.66	4.47	4.55	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	596/1486	4.79	4.63	4.32	4.41	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	789/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	943/1277	3.33	4.18	4.03	4.04	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	335/1279	4.83	4.67	4.17	4.31	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.83	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	773/1269	4.67	4.77	4.35	4.55	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	415/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.33	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.77	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	44/ 72	4.58	4.56	4.64	4.64	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 80	4.46	4.53	4.61	4.52	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	146/ 375	4.46	4.53	4.01	3.90	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: AMST 490 0101
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: LOVIGLIO, JASON
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 55
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: AMST 490 0201
 Title SENIOR SEMINAR
 Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PAT
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 56
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	637/1576	4.20	4.41	4.30	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1576	4.32	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	511/1520	4.35	4.50	4.25	4.38	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	850/1465	4.20	4.44	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.40	4.44	4.14	4.30	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1041/1547	4.20	4.34	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1324/1574	4.18	4.41	4.64	4.69	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.50	4.38	4.10	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.86	4.66	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.79	4.63	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.71	4.61	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.33	4.18	4.03	4.04	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	4.83	4.67	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.83	4.76	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.67	4.77	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	4.58	4.28	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	76/ 85	4.50	4.44	4.72	4.77	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.89	4.69	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	47/ 72	4.58	4.56	4.64	4.64	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	66/ 80	4.46	4.53	4.61	4.52	4.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	176/ 375	4.46	4.53	4.01	3.90	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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 610 0101
 Title MULTICULT IDENTITY
 Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PAT
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 57
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.41	4.30	4.43	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.45	4.27	4.32	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.51	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.50	4.25	4.36	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.44	4.12	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.44	4.14	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.34	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.41	4.64	4.75	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.71	4.38	4.10	4.18	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.66	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.63	4.32	4.37	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	274/1489	4.83	4.61	4.32	4.38	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	532/1279	4.43	4.67	4.17	4.34	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.76	4.35	4.53	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.77	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	688/ 878	3.60	4.28	4.05	4.11	3.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	74/ 85	4.33	4.44	4.72	4.79	4.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	52/ 79	4.67	4.89	4.69	4.77	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 72	4.50	4.56	4.64	4.70	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 80	4.67	4.53	4.61	4.70	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	146/ 375	4.67	4.53	4.01	4.10	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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