

Course-Section: ART 210 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 91
 FEB 11, 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	0	5	8	4.62	497/1649	3.93	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	614/1648	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	546/1375	4.45	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	462/1595	4.40	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	815/1533	3.05	3.87	4.04	4.04	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	4	2	3	3.23	1383/1512	3.07	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	284/1623	3.99	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	4.94	4.70	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	374/1621	4.14	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	683/1568	4.48	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	4.78	4.77	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1564	4.40	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	306/1559	4.28	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	129/1352	4.29	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	412/1384	4.01	4.11	4.08	3.99	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.45	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	624/1368	4.60	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	431/ 948	3.78	3.97	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 555	4.89	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.33	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 210 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 92
 FEB 11, 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	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	1183/1649	3.93	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	209/1648	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1375	4.45	4.50	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	186/1595	4.40	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1400/1533	3.05	3.87	4.04	4.04	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1234/1512	3.07	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	568/1623	3.99	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	4.94	4.70	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	754/1621	4.14	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	245/1568	4.48	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1108/1572	4.78	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	390/1564	4.40	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	763/1559	4.28	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	101/1352	4.29	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	901/1384	4.01	4.11	4.08	3.99	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	831/1382	4.45	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	426/1368	4.60	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	203/ 948	3.78	3.97	3.95	3.89	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	49/ 243	4.67	4.67	4.12	4.47	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	263/ 555	4.89	4.98	4.29	4.33	4.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/ 288	4.67	4.20	3.68	3.65	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	41/ 312	4.33	4.40	3.68	3.59	4.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	

Course-Section: ART 210 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 92
 FEB 11, 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 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 11 Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 93
 FEB 11, 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	2	5	3	7	0	2.88	1621/1649	3.93	4.29	4.28	4.29	2.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	4	5	2	3.27	1561/1648	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	****/1375	4.45	4.50	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	7	3	3.56	1382/1595	4.40	4.24	4.20	4.22	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	8	1	3	0	2.19	1522/1533	3.05	3.87	4.04	4.04	2.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	6	3	4	0	2.60	1491/1512	3.07	3.76	4.10	4.14	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	4	7	1	3.19	1501/1623	3.99	3.94	4.16	4.21	3.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	799/1646	4.94	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	6	4	1	3.55	1327/1621	4.14	4.12	4.06	4.01	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	4	3	5	3.53	1454/1568	4.48	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1241/1572	4.78	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1403/1564	4.40	4.33	4.28	4.27	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	7	3	2	3.20	1448/1559	4.28	4.24	4.29	4.33	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	1	6	2	2	3.08	1210/1352	4.29	4.38	3.98	4.07	3.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1039/1384	4.01	4.11	4.08	3.99	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	757/1382	4.45	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	827/1368	4.60	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	3	1	2	0	2.83	887/ 948	3.78	3.97	3.95	3.89	2.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	4.67	4.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	233/ 555	4.89	4.98	4.29	4.33	4.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 288	4.67	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	4.33	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 93
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 210 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 94
 FEB 11, 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	2	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	1007/1649	3.93	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	1021/1648	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1375	4.45	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	291/1595	4.40	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	7	1	1	2.85	1484/1533	3.05	3.87	4.04	4.04	2.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	4	2	1	2.90	1459/1512	3.07	3.76	4.10	4.14	2.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	4	3	5	3.64	1327/1623	3.99	3.94	4.16	4.21	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.94	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	632/1621	4.14	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	344/1568	4.48	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	4.78	4.77	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	651/1564	4.40	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	512/1559	4.28	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	432/1352	4.29	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	795/1384	4.01	4.11	4.08	3.99	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	799/1382	4.45	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	369/1368	4.60	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 948	3.78	3.97	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	4.67	4.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 555	4.89	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	4.67	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.33	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	

Course-Section: ART 210 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 94
 FEB 11, 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	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 95
 FEB 11, 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	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	696/1649	4.56	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	614/1648	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	950/1375	4.30	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	383/1595	4.53	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	4	3	3.50	1249/1533	3.51	3.87	4.04	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	6	3	1	3.36	1334/1512	3.30	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	395/1623	4.14	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1230/1646	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	595/1621	4.43	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	852/1568	4.63	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	715/1572	4.72	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	754/1564	4.49	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	881/1559	4.44	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	208/1352	4.40	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	613/1384	4.30	4.11	4.08	3.99	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	555/1382	4.45	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	426/1368	4.58	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	170/ 948	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.89	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	231/ 555	4.94	4.98	4.29	4.33	4.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****

Course-Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 95
 FEB 11, 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	1	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 96
 FEB 11, 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	4	10	4.71	372/1649	4.56	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	556/1648	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	464/1375	4.30	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	697/1595	4.53	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	3	4	3.64	1153/1533	3.51	3.87	4.04	4.04	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	6	2	2	3.33	1345/1512	3.30	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	861/1623	4.14	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	428/1621	4.43	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	554/1568	4.63	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1096/1572	4.72	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	580/1564	4.49	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	695/1559	4.44	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	590/1352	4.40	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	530/1384	4.30	4.11	4.08	3.99	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	774/1382	4.45	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	742/1368	4.58	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	821/ 948	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.89	3.17	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	4.94	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 97
 FEB 11, 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	0	4	11	4.50	644/1649	4.56	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	897/1648	4.41	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	763/1375	4.30	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	362/1595	4.53	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	5	2	3.40	1317/1533	3.51	3.87	4.04	4.04	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	4	5	2	3.20	1395/1512	3.30	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	7	7	1	3.60	1347/1623	4.14	3.94	4.16	4.21	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1391/1646	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	374/1621	4.43	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	636/1568	4.63	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	1071/1572	4.72	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	702/1564	4.49	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	749/1559	4.44	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	415/1352	4.40	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	737/1384	4.30	4.11	4.08	3.99	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	696/1382	4.45	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	0	12	4.57	601/1368	4.58	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	776/ 948	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.89	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	4.94	4.98	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ART 211 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 97
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	6	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 212 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 98
 FEB 11, 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	1	4	2	4	3.58	1476/1649	3.19	4.29	4.28	4.29	3.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	4	1	3.17	1577/1648	3.01	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1375	3.46	4.50	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	1335/1595	3.32	4.24	4.20	4.22	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1249/1533	3.05	3.87	4.04	4.04	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	5	0	2.83	1470/1512	2.78	3.76	4.10	4.14	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	5	2	1	2.91	1560/1623	3.06	3.94	4.16	4.21	2.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	782/1646	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	0	5	3	0	2.73	1565/1621	2.92	4.12	4.06	4.01	2.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1347/1568	3.75	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	815/1572	4.54	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1455/1564	3.34	4.33	4.28	4.27	3.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	5	3	3.55	1359/1559	3.37	4.24	4.29	4.33	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	1117/1352	3.41	4.38	3.98	4.07	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	953/1384	3.40	4.11	4.08	3.99	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	917/1382	4.16	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1162/1368	3.93	4.46	4.30	4.21	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	887/ 948	2.80	3.97	3.95	3.89	2.83	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.00	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 99
 FEB 11, 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	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	1603/1649	3.19	4.29	4.28	4.29	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	1633/1648	3.01	4.26	4.23	4.25	2.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1360/1375	3.46	4.50	4.27	4.37	2.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	2	1	1	2.44	1586/1595	3.32	4.24	4.20	4.22	2.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	2	1	2.80	1490/1533	3.05	3.87	4.04	4.04	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	2	1	0	1	1.89	1508/1512	2.78	3.76	4.10	4.14	1.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	1	3	1	2.60	1596/1623	3.06	3.94	4.16	4.21	2.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	714/1646	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1595/1621	2.92	4.12	4.06	4.01	2.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1488/1568	3.75	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	1193/1572	4.54	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	4	1	1	2.78	1529/1564	3.34	4.33	4.28	4.27	2.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	1	1	2.78	1515/1559	3.37	4.24	4.29	4.33	2.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	2	1	2	2.89	1260/1352	3.41	4.38	3.98	4.07	2.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	4	0	2.88	1304/1384	3.40	4.11	4.08	3.99	2.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	946/1382	4.16	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1138/1368	3.93	4.46	4.30	4.21	3.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	929/ 948	2.80	3.97	3.95	3.89	2.25	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: YOUNG, SHANNON
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 100
 FEB 11, 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	4	3	4	4	0	2.53	1639/1649	3.19	4.29	4.28	4.29	2.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	6	3	1	2.80	1612/1648	3.01	4.26	4.23	4.25	2.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1375	3.46	4.50	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1452/1595	3.32	4.24	4.20	4.22	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	3	2	4	1	2.92	1472/1533	3.05	3.87	4.04	4.04	2.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	1	5	1	1	2.80	1476/1512	2.78	3.76	4.10	4.14	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	3	2	2	2.79	1574/1623	3.06	3.94	4.16	4.21	2.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	1230/1646	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	1	10	2	0	3.08	1492/1621	2.92	4.12	4.06	4.01	3.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	2	7	2	3.54	1454/1568	3.75	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	1305/1572	4.54	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	1	4	4	3.54	1379/1564	3.34	4.33	4.28	4.27	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	1412/1559	3.37	4.24	4.29	4.33	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	2	2	3	4	3.38	1109/1352	3.41	4.38	3.98	4.07	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1181/1384	3.40	4.11	4.08	3.99	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	812/1382	4.16	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	827/1368	3.93	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	894/ 948	2.80	3.97	3.95	3.89	2.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.40	3.68	3.59	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: YOUNG, SHANNON
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 101
 FEB 11, 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	6	4	4	3.63	1457/1649	3.19	4.29	4.28	4.29	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1461/1648	3.01	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	806/1375	3.46	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	3	3	6	3.80	1260/1595	3.32	4.24	4.20	4.22	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	5	6	1	2	3.00	1441/1533	3.05	3.87	4.04	4.04	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1214/1512	2.78	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	5	2	7	3.93	1134/1623	3.06	3.94	4.16	4.21	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	714/1646	4.76	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	5	4	2	3.46	1369/1621	2.92	4.12	4.06	4.01	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	1137/1568	3.75	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1352/1572	4.54	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1282/1564	3.34	4.33	4.28	4.27	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1270/1559	3.37	4.24	4.29	4.33	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	690/1352	3.41	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	1011/1384	3.40	4.11	4.08	3.99	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	831/1382	4.16	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	844/1368	3.93	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	758/ 948	2.80	3.97	3.95	3.89	3.38	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.00	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: DAVIS, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 102
 FEB 11, 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	4	9	4.38	816/1649	4.04	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	487/1648	4.02	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	254/1595	4.29	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	703/1533	3.86	3.87	4.04	4.04	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1512	3.60	3.76	4.10	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	894/1623	3.85	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	571/1621	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	636/1568	4.03	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572	4.72	4.77	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	473/1564	4.09	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	586/1559	4.02	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	221/1352	4.31	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	613/1384	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.99	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	616/1382	4.15	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1368	4.35	4.46	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.22	3.97	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	4.25	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ART 213 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: DAVIS, PHILLIP
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 102
 FEB 11, 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	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 103
 FEB 11, 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	1	4	9	4.57	550/1649	4.04	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	556/1648	4.02	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	462/1595	4.29	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1180/1533	3.86	3.87	4.04	4.04	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1202/1512	3.60	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	994/1623	3.85	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	632/1621	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	588/1568	4.03	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	912/1572	4.72	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	434/1564	4.09	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	749/1559	4.02	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	81/1352	4.31	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	541/1384	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.99	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	342/1382	4.15	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	493/1368	4.35	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	249/ 948	4.22	3.97	3.95	3.89	4.44	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.25	4.20	3.68	3.65	4.25	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	3	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: RIOS, JORGE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 104
 FEB 11, 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	4	1	2	2	0	2.22	1647/1649	4.04	4.29	4.28	4.29	2.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	1	2	0	2.11	1646/1648	4.02	4.26	4.23	4.25	2.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	2	2	1	2.88	1557/1595	4.29	4.24	4.20	4.22	2.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1512	3.60	3.76	4.10	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1594/1623	3.85	3.94	4.16	4.21	2.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1498/1646	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	1	3	0	0	2.00	1610/1621	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.01	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	6	1	0	2	0	1.78	1566/1568	4.03	4.35	4.43	4.39	1.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1445/1572	4.72	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.11	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	1	1	2	0	2.00	1559/1564	4.09	4.33	4.28	4.27	2.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	1	2	0	2.00	1550/1559	4.02	4.24	4.29	4.33	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	4	0	1	2	2.67	1287/1352	4.31	4.38	3.98	4.07	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	1	1	0	0	1.43	1379/1384	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.99	1.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	3	1	2	0	2.57	1358/1382	4.15	4.44	4.29	4.19	2.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1286/1368	4.35	4.46	4.30	4.21	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	4.22	3.97	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.25	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 105
 FEB 11, 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	0	0	10	5.00	1/1649	4.04	4.29	4.28	4.29	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	148/1648	4.02	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1595	4.29	4.24	4.20	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1017/1533	3.86	3.87	4.04	4.04	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1512	3.60	3.76	4.10	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	502/1623	3.85	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1364/1646	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	3.81	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	4.03	4.35	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	4.72	4.77	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	4.09	4.33	4.28	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	4.02	4.24	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1352	4.31	4.38	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.99	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	435/1382	4.15	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	472/1368	4.35	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 948	4.22	3.97	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	4.25	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	

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
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 214 0101
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: BOWLER, RUTH S
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 106
 FEB 11, 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	0	0	4	1	4	1	0	2.20	1648/1649	3.37	4.29	4.28	4.29	2.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	0	5	2	0	2.60	1630/1648	3.37	4.26	4.23	4.25	2.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	3	0	2	2.78	1568/1595	3.52	4.24	4.20	4.22	2.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1499/1533	2.63	3.87	4.04	4.04	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1512	****	3.76	4.10	4.14	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	1	4	0	0	2.00	1615/1623	2.67	3.94	4.16	4.21	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.45	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	5	1	4	0	0	1.90	1615/1621	3.15	4.12	4.06	4.01	1.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	4	1	0	2.56	1553/1568	3.40	4.35	4.43	4.39	2.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	3	2	0	1	2.38	1570/1572	3.87	4.77	4.70	4.73	2.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	2	0	0	2.00	1559/1564	3.27	4.33	4.28	4.27	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	3	0	0	2.13	1545/1559	3.46	4.24	4.29	4.33	2.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1352	4.17	4.38	3.98	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	4	1	0	2.50	1346/1384	3.31	4.11	4.08	3.99	2.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1229/1382	3.84	4.44	4.29	4.19	3.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	2	0	1	2	2.86	1319/1368	3.89	4.46	4.30	4.21	2.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.65	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 214 0201
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: SHAFIE, HADIEH
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 107
 FEB 11, 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	2	2	4	2	5	3.40	1524/1649	3.37	4.29	4.28	4.29	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	3	4	3	3.07	1588/1648	3.37	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	4.00	4.50	4.27	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	4	3	3.33	1470/1595	3.52	4.24	4.20	4.22	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	1502/1533	2.63	3.87	4.04	4.04	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	3.76	4.10	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	7	0	3	2	1	2.23	1610/1623	2.67	3.94	4.16	4.21	2.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1325/1646	4.45	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	3	6	3	1	3.00	1504/1621	3.15	4.12	4.06	4.01	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1496/1568	3.40	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1365/1572	3.87	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	1	5	3	3.50	1388/1564	3.27	4.33	4.28	4.27	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	2	5	3.67	1322/1559	3.46	4.24	4.29	4.33	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	970/1352	4.17	4.38	3.98	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	1105/1384	3.31	4.11	4.08	3.99	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1216/1382	3.84	4.44	4.29	4.19	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	948/1368	3.89	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	4.00	3.97	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	

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	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	5
84-150	0	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				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 214 0301
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: KISSACK, LYLE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 108
 FEB 11, 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	2	2	8	4.50	644/1649	3.37	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	629/1648	3.37	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	580/1595	3.52	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1533	2.63	3.87	4.04	4.04	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1512	****	3.76	4.10	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1258/1623	2.67	3.94	4.16	4.21	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	4.45	4.70	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	331/1621	3.15	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	983/1568	3.40	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572	3.87	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	887/1564	3.27	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	586/1559	3.46	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	208/1352	4.17	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	795/1384	3.31	4.11	4.08	3.99	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	540/1382	3.84	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	369/1368	3.89	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.97	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.47	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****	

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 0	Major 5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 12	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 215 0101
 Title INTRO TO ART & MEDIA
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 169
 Questionnaires: 112

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 109
 FEB 11, 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	9	0	1	2	14	26	60	4.38	816/1649	4.38	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	4	4	12	25	58	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	73	0	1	0	6	21	4.68	391/1375	4.68	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.68	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	10	2	2	13	23	52	4.32	746/1595	4.32	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	14	1	2	15	20	48	4.30	575/1533	4.30	3.87	4.04	4.04	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	1	2	1	12	29	58	4.37	553/1512	4.37	3.76	4.10	4.14	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	1	3	4	10	22	63	4.35	696/1623	4.35	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	28	75	4.73	961/1646	4.73	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	4	0	11	40	34	4.12	835/1621	4.12	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	3	15	82	4.79	405/1568	4.79	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	11	87	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	5	16	77	4.73	374/1564	4.73	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	6	17	75	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	0	0	2	7	89	4.89	107/1352	4.89	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	7	2	16	11	23	3.69	997/1384	3.69	4.11	4.08	3.99	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	53	0	6	2	7	8	36	4.12	917/1382	4.12	4.44	4.29	4.19	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	1	0	7	6	46	4.60	579/1368	4.60	4.46	4.30	4.21	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	52	49	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	111	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	1	0	0	0	0	80	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	110	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	110	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	110	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	110	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	80	0	0	0	0	25	7	4.22	70/ 288	4.22	4.20	3.68	3.65	4.22	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	111	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	111	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	111	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	111	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	76	1	0	0	0	30	5	4.14	62/ 312	4.14	4.40	3.68	3.59	4.14	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	111	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	111	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	104	1	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ART 215 0101
 Title INTRO TO ART & MEDIA
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 169
 Questionnaires: 112

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 109
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	3	A	59	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	69
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	20	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	112	Non-major	43
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	80				
				?	5						

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 120
 Questionnaires: 77

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 110
 FEB 11, 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	2	10	28	35	4.24	986/1649	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	7	25	43	4.45	643/1648	4.45	4.26	4.23	4.25	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	15	56	4.67	391/1375	4.67	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	13	28	28	4.22	865/1595	4.22	4.24	4.20	4.22	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	1	6	15	44	4.49	377/1533	4.49	3.87	4.04	4.04	4.49	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	17	30	23	3.93	980/1512	3.93	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	12	20	37	4.12	968/1623	4.12	3.94	4.16	4.21	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	72	4.95	398/1646	4.95	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	0	13	25	21	4.14	824/1621	4.14	4.12	4.06	4.01	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	15	56	4.74	517/1568	4.74	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	68	4.91	591/1572	4.91	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	6	19	48	4.58	580/1564	4.58	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	12	60	4.78	347/1559	4.78	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	2	1	10	51	4.72	177/1352	4.72	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	5	15	18	18	3.82	926/1384	3.82	4.11	4.08	3.99	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	1	4	13	15	23	3.98	963/1382	3.98	4.44	4.29	4.19	3.98	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	6	11	17	20	3.94	998/1368	3.94	4.46	4.30	4.21	3.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	35	2	6	9	2	2	2.81	890/ 948	2.81	3.97	3.95	3.89	2.81	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	72	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	75	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	74	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	2	1	0	1	0	56	4.90	229/ 555	4.90	4.98	4.29	4.33	4.90	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	75	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	75	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	75	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	75	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	1	0	0	1	10	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	76	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	75	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	75	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	65	1	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	73	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	73	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	75	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	69	1	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 120
 Questionnaires: 77

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 110
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 33	Required for Majors 31	Graduate 0 Major 23
28-55	15	1.00-1.99 0	B 32		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 6	C 4	General 10	Under-grad 77 Non-major 54
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 33	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 116
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 111
 FEB 11, 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	5	13	25	31	4.11	1116/1649	4.11	4.29	4.28	4.29	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	8	16	21	26	3.80	1319/1648	3.80	4.26	4.23	4.25	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	9	22	17	25	3.76	1112/1375	3.76	4.50	4.27	4.37	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	3	3	14	25	21	3.88	1219/1595	3.88	4.24	4.20	4.22	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	13	20	36	4.22	653/1533	4.22	3.87	4.04	4.04	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	6	5	21	24	16	3.54	1240/1512	3.54	3.76	4.10	4.14	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	2	9	16	18	26	3.80	1241/1623	3.80	3.94	4.16	4.21	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	14	57	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.63	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	2	0	2	24	27	8	3.67	1254/1621	3.67	4.12	4.06	4.01	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	6	16	46	4.48	891/1568	4.48	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	65	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.77	4.70	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	8	24	34	4.17	1028/1564	4.17	4.33	4.28	4.27	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	8	15	44	4.49	722/1559	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.33	4.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	2	2	3	12	46	4.51	303/1352	4.51	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.51	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	10	10	8	6	13	3.04	1251/1384	3.04	4.11	4.08	3.99	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	9	9	12	6	11	3.02	1314/1382	3.02	4.44	4.29	4.19	3.02	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	6	9	11	7	14	3.30	1241/1368	3.30	4.46	4.30	4.21	3.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	39	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	65	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	66	0	2	1	0	0	5	3.63	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	66	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	68	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	6	0	0	0	1	56	4.98	46/ 555	4.98	4.98	4.29	4.33	4.98	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	65	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	65	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	66	1	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	65	5	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	61	3	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	68	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	67	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	68	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	67	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	3	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	67	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	67	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	67	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	67	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	66	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 116
 Questionnaires: 74

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 111
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	4	A	18	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	42						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	8	Under-grad	74	Non-major	51
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	42				
				?	1						

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	0	2	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1259/1375	3.33	4.50	4.27	4.22	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	782/1595	4.29	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	966/1533	3.86	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1363/1512	3.29	3.76	4.10	4.11	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	936/1623	4.14	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	191/1621	4.71	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1205/1568	4.14	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	580/1564	4.57	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	804/1559	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 315 0101
 Title VIDEO I
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 113
 FEB 11, 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	2	1	4	4.29	933/1649	4.29	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	347/1375	4.71	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	608/1595	4.43	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	815/1533	4.00	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	0	0	4	3.83	1068/1512	3.83	3.76	4.10	4.11	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	261/1623	4.71	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	767/1568	4.57	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	754/1564	4.43	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	618/1559	4.57	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	177/1352	4.71	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	673/1384	4.25	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 312	4.50	4.40	3.68	3.60	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ART 315 0101
 Title VIDEO I
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 113
 FEB 11, 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	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 320 0101
 Title INTRO TO PRINTMAKING
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 114
 FEB 11, 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	1	7	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1180/1533	3.60	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1512	****	3.76	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	1	3	0	2	1	2.86	1565/1623	2.86	3.94	4.16	4.08	2.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	720/1621	4.22	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.35	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	524/1564	4.63	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	512/1559	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	4.86	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	252/ 555	4.75	4.98	4.29	4.22	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ART 320 0101
 Title INTRO TO PRINTMAKING
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 114
 FEB 11, 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	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 323 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 115
 FEB 11, 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	3	0	0	0	4	7	19	4.50	644/1649	4.63	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	11	14	4.23	920/1648	4.53	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	6	9	13	4.10	915/1375	4.41	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	12	7	9	3.68	1329/1595	4.11	4.24	4.20	4.21	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	4	9	6	9	3.62	1166/1533	3.91	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	4	13	8	3	3.20	1395/1512	3.70	3.76	4.10	4.11	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	0	9	8	11	3.97	1089/1623	4.32	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	25	3	4.00	1544/1646	4.48	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	4	12	7	4.04	892/1621	4.35	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	620/1568	4.74	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	615/1572	4.88	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	5	8	14	4.33	854/1564	4.56	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	390/1559	4.77	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	423/1352	4.60	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	4	4	6	3.65	1020/1384	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.11	3.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	1038/1382	4.12	4.44	4.29	4.37	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	1063/1368	4.23	4.46	4.30	4.39	3.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	15	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 948	4.00	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	33	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 323 0102
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: FAGAN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 116
 FEB 11, 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	0	1	5	23	4.76	328/1649	4.63	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	202/1648	4.53	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	334/1375	4.41	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	462/1595	4.11	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	9	15	4.21	673/1533	3.91	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	8	14	4.21	747/1512	3.70	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	3	22	4.68	308/1623	4.32	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	266/1646	4.48	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	234/1621	4.35	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	405/1568	4.74	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	690/1572	4.88	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	23	4.79	294/1564	4.56	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	332/1559	4.77	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	126/1352	4.60	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	7	14	4.36	582/1384	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	5	16	4.36	749/1382	4.12	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	541/1368	4.23	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	17	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ART 323 0102
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: FAGAN, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 116
 FEB 11, 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	3	A	10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 324 0101
 Title HISTORY OF FILM TO 196
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 117
 FEB 11, 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	4	0	1	1	6	9	20	4.24	975/1649	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	2	8	8	18	4.08	1076/1648	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	4	6	9	16	3.97	975/1375	3.97	4.50	4.27	4.22	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	21	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	4	7	23	4.56	327/1533	4.56	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	15	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	1	6	9	18	4.20	883/1623	4.20	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	8	27	4.77	881/1646	4.77	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	2	3	17	6	3.96	972/1621	3.96	4.12	4.06	4.02	3.96
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	4	2	29	4.71	554/1568	4.71	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	1	33	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	2	5	25	4.56	600/1564	4.56	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	2	2	26	4.34	891/1559	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	2	1	32	4.86	117/1352	4.86	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	6	2	8	1	6	2.96	1277/1384	2.96	4.11	4.08	4.11	2.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	5	2	8	1	7	3.13	1304/1382	3.13	4.44	4.29	4.37	3.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	4	1	7	1	10	3.52	1173/1368	3.52	4.46	4.30	4.39	3.52
4. Were special techniques successful	19	19	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	1	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	12
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 326 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: STEPHANY, JAROM
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 118
 FEB 11, 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	4	6	13	4.39	789/1649	4.39	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	9	4	9	3.87	1262/1648	3.87	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	12	4.17	868/1375	4.17	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	759/1595	4.30	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	875/1533	3.94	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	7	11	4.13	808/1512	4.13	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	6	4	5	6	3.41	1434/1623	3.41	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	372/1568	4.82	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	0	2	17	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	434/1559	4.73	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	133/1352	4.81	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	774/1384	4.07	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	716/1382	4.40	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	449/1368	4.73	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 119
 FEB 11, 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	0	2	8	4.55	590/1649	4.56	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	510/1648	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.72	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	263/1595	4.63	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1139/1533	3.83	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	883/1512	4.13	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	358/1623	4.37	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1317/1646	4.47	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	456/1621	4.11	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568	4.59	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.94	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	253/1564	4.52	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	475/1559	4.51	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	303/1352	4.26	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	275/1384	4.59	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	332/1382	4.53	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	461/1368	4.47	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/ 948	4.23	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.86	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	4.97	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 331 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 120
 FEB 11, 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	5	11	4.69	408/1649	4.56	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	487/1648	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	296/1375	4.72	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	362/1595	4.63	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1533	3.83	3.87	4.04	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1512	4.13	3.76	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	437/1623	4.37	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1491/1646	4.47	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	914/1621	4.11	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	636/1568	4.59	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572	4.94	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	374/1564	4.52	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	419/1559	4.51	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	582/1352	4.26	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	120/1384	4.59	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	383/1382	4.53	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	493/1368	4.47	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	678/ 948	4.23	3.97	3.95	4.00	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	205/ 555	4.97	4.98	4.29	4.22	4.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.00	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ART 331 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 120
 FEB 11, 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	1	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 331 0301
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 121
 FEB 11, 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	1	5	7	4.46	696/1649	4.56	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	614/1648	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1375	4.72	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	451/1595	4.63	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	815/1533	3.83	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	687/1512	4.13	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	1164/1623	4.37	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	531/1646	4.47	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	1060/1621	4.11	4.12	4.06	4.02	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	1104/1568	4.59	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.94	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1127/1564	4.52	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1079/1559	4.51	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	633/1352	4.26	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	749/1384	4.59	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	946/1382	4.53	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	948/1368	4.47	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	4.23	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	4.97	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.20	3.68	3.58	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13	Non-major 1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, ARI
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 122
 FEB 11, 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	2	1	7	4.18	1037/1649	4.47	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	629/1648	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	291/1595	4.68	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1065/1533	4.13	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	5	1	2	3.33	1462/1623	3.71	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.08	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	374/1621	4.61	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	1220/1568	4.50	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	908/1564	4.64	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	804/1559	4.65	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	177/1352	4.86	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	4.75	4.11	4.08	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.82	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	579/1368	4.72	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	4.50	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 332 0102
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, ARI
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 123
 FEB 11, 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	9	4.75	328/1649	4.47	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	464/1648	4.52	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1595	4.68	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	366/1533	4.13	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.76	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	989/1623	3.71	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1462/1646	4.08	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	185/1621	4.61	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	287/1568	4.50	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1564	4.64	4.33	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1559	4.65	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1352	4.86	4.38	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1384	4.75	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.82	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368	4.72	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ART 332 0102
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, ARI
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 123
 FEB 11, 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	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	1
84-150	3	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 333 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 124
 FEB 11, 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	0	1	9	4.90	186/1649	4.81	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.24	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	575/1533	4.33	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1512	4.67	3.76	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	284/1623	4.67	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1103/1646	4.44	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1621	4.69	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1568	4.75	4.35	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	4.90	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1564	4.90	4.33	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1559	4.90	4.24	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	157/1352	4.57	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	185/1384	4.85	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	4.93	4.46	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	122/ 948	4.63	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: ART 333 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 124
 FEB 11, 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	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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: ART 333 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 125
 FEB 11, 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	8	4.73	361/1649	4.81	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.24	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	515/1533	4.33	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1512	4.67	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	358/1623	4.67	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1384/1646	4.44	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	374/1621	4.69	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	852/1568	4.75	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	840/1572	4.90	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	263/1564	4.90	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	318/1559	4.90	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	399/1352	4.57	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	4.85	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	696/1382	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1368	4.93	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	203/ 948	4.63	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 334 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 126
 FEB 11, 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	1	3	4	2	3.45	1511/1649	2.85	4.29	4.28	4.27	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1504/1648	2.94	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	1	3	1	3.00	1537/1595	2.71	4.24	4.20	4.21	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	4	1	1	2.70	1588/1623	2.52	3.94	4.16	4.08	2.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1157/1646	4.40	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1566/1621	2.54	4.12	4.06	4.02	2.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1440/1568	3.01	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1174/1572	4.20	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1127/1564	3.21	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1246/1559	2.94	4.24	4.29	4.23	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	970/1352	2.92	4.38	3.98	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1202/1384	3.16	4.11	4.08	4.11	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	1195/1382	3.55	4.44	4.29	4.37	3.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	3	2	2	2	3.33	1229/1368	3.26	4.46	4.30	4.39	3.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	578/ 948	3.10	3.97	3.95	4.00	3.80	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 11 Non-major 4
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	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 334 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 127
 FEB 11, 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	4	0	5	2	3	1	1	2.25	1647/1649	2.85	4.29	4.28	4.27	2.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	5	2	2	1	2	2.42	1639/1648	2.94	4.26	4.23	4.18	2.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	6	1	2	0	3	2.42	1588/1595	2.71	4.24	4.20	4.21	2.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1533	****	3.87	4.04	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1512	****	3.76	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	3	4	2	1	0	2	2.33	1608/1623	2.52	3.94	4.16	4.08	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1398/1646	4.40	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	3	1	2	0	2.38	1599/1621	2.54	4.12	4.06	4.02	2.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	3	3	0	2	2.42	1557/1568	3.01	4.35	4.43	4.39	2.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1506/1572	4.20	4.77	4.70	4.64	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	4	3	3	0	2	2.42	1550/1564	3.21	4.33	4.28	4.25	2.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	7	1	2	0	2	2.08	1546/1559	2.94	4.24	4.29	4.23	2.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	1331/1352	2.92	4.38	3.98	3.97	2.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	1	0	2	4	3.09	1248/1384	3.16	4.11	4.08	4.11	3.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1199/1382	3.55	4.44	4.29	4.37	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	5	2	2	3.18	1269/1368	3.26	4.46	4.30	4.39	3.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	3	0	0	1	1	2.40	923/ 948	3.10	3.97	3.95	4.00	2.40	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	11	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	0	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	12				
				? 0						

Course-Section: ART 335 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN V
 Instructor: FAGAN, JASON
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 128
 FEB 11, 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	2	0	0	0	4	8	39	4.69	408/1649	4.69	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	8	40	4.71	310/1648	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	8	41	4.75	309/1375	4.75	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	4	13	28	4.48	538/1595	4.48	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	5	3	40	4.67	233/1533	4.67	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	2	10	8	27	4.21	747/1512	4.21	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	4	6	37	4.65	345/1623	4.65	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	36	4.71	993/1646	4.71	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	0	4	12	21	4.46	442/1621	4.46	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	43	4.84	330/1568	4.84	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	46	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	8	37	4.62	524/1564	4.62	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	2	1	5	41	4.73	419/1559	4.73	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	1	2	5	40	4.75	157/1352	4.75	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	3	3	3	9	19	4.03	788/1384	4.03	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.03	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	3	1	4	28	4.49	636/1382	4.49	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.49	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	33	4.84	337/1368	4.84	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	28	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	46
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	53	Non-major	7
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	24	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	45				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 341 0101
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 129
 FEB 11, 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	0	0	1	11	4.92	167/1649	4.92	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	133/1595	4.91	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	303/1533	4.58	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.76	4.10	4.11	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	220/1623	4.75	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	245/1568	4.91	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1564	4.91	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	205/1559	4.91	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 342 0101
 Title FILM/VIDEO THEORY & CR
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 130
 FEB 11, 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	12	4.69	408/1649	4.69	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	487/1648	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	694/1375	4.38	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	272/1533	4.63	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	248/1512	4.69	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	370/1623	4.63	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1081/1646	4.63	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	261/1621	4.64	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	374/1564	4.73	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	536/1559	4.64	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	81/1352	4.93	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	388/1384	4.58	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	555/1382	4.58	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	409/ 948	4.10	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.10	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 347 0101
 Title WRITING FOR MEDIA ARTS
 Instructor: CLARK, JOE C.
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 131
 FEB 11, 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	4	7	3	3.80	1351/1649	3.80	4.29	4.28	4.27	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	5	2	3.40	1527/1648	3.40	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	4	3	3.53	1389/1595	3.53	4.24	4.20	4.21	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	4	4	3.73	1084/1533	3.73	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	808/1512	4.13	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1405/1623	3.47	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	6	5	0	3.07	1492/1621	3.07	4.12	4.06	4.02	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	1362/1568	3.87	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	1439/1572	4.13	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	7	1	3.40	1427/1564	3.40	4.33	4.28	4.25	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	4	3	3.40	1408/1559	3.40	4.24	4.29	4.23	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	399/1352	4.40	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	4	1	3.60	1039/1384	3.60	4.11	4.08	4.11	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	716/1382	4.40	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	619/ 948	3.71	3.97	3.95	4.00	3.71	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 360 0101
 Title MIXED MEDIA BOOK ARTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 132
 FEB 11, 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	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	0	1	2.67	1499/1533	2.67	3.87	4.04	4.05	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1487/1512	2.67	3.76	4.10	4.11	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1318/1623	3.67	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.12	4.06	4.02	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	4.20	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	

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	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 362 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTOGRP
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 133
 FEB 11, 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	8	4.73	361/1649	4.73	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	291/1648	4.73	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	566/1595	4.45	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	915/1533	3.91	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1512	4.33	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	683/1623	4.36	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	288/1621	4.47	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1568	4.83	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572	4.95	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1564	4.83	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1559	4.90	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	133/1352	4.80	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	406/1384	4.56	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	373/1382	4.78	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.80	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 362 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTOGRP
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 134
 FEB 11, 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	8	4.73	361/1649	4.73	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	291/1648	4.73	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	566/1595	4.45	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	915/1533	3.91	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1512	4.33	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	683/1623	4.36	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1621	4.47	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	636/1568	4.83	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	4.95	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.83	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1559	4.90	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1352	4.80	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	406/1384	4.56	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	373/1382	4.78	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.80	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 363 0101
 Title COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 135
 FEB 11, 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	0	5	5	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	756/1648	4.36	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.22	****		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	451/1595	4.55	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	915/1533	3.91	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	568/1623	4.45	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	664/1646	4.91	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	339/1621	4.55	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	803/1568	4.55	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	815/1572	4.82	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	871/1559	4.36	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	280/1352	4.55	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	376/1384	4.60	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	493/1368	4.70	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	365/ 948	4.20	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.20	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	58/ 288	4.33	4.20	3.68	3.58	4.33	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0 Graduate
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	9

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 364 0101
 Title STUDIO PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 136
 FEB 11, 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	11	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	405/1595	4.58	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1533	4.50	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1512	****	3.76	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	720/1623	4.33	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	75/1621	4.92	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	535/1568	4.73	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	306/1559	4.82	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	133/1352	4.80	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	150/1384	4.90	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	122/ 948	4.75	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 366 0101
 Title DOCUMENTARY PHOTOGRAPH
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 137
 FEB 11, 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	4	4.43	749/1649	4.43	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.24	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	545/1533	4.33	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1068/1512	3.83	3.76	4.10	4.11	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	915/1623	4.17	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	554/1568	4.71	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	804/1559	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/1352	4.83	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	800/ 948	3.25	3.97	3.95	4.00	3.25	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	7
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: ART 367 0101
 Title ALTERNATIVE PROCESSES
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 138
 FEB 11, 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	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	212/1649	4.88	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	383/1595	4.60	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1533	4.75	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	815/1623	4.25	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1012/1568	4.38	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	812/1564	4.38	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	861/1559	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	965/1384	3.75	4.11	4.08	4.11	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 370 0101
 Title SILKSCREEN PRINTING
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 139
 FEB 11, 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	6	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	414/1648	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1533	****	3.87	4.04	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	608/1623	4.43	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1169/1568	4.20	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1246/1559	3.80	4.24	4.29	4.23	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	571/1384	4.38	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1382	4.63	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 380 0101
 Title HIST & THEORY OF GAMES
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 140
 FEB 11, 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	5	13	18	4.27	943/1649	4.27	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	9	13	10	3.73	1368/1648	3.73	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	10	17	7	3.73	1127/1375	3.73	4.50	4.27	4.22	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	2	7	12	14	4.09	1021/1595	4.09	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	6	11	8	10	3.49	1262/1533	3.49	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.49	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	6	16	10	3.89	1035/1512	3.89	3.76	4.10	4.11	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	6	10	10	9	3.49	1396/1623	3.49	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	597/1646	4.91	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	17	11	4.11	847/1621	4.11	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	13	18	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	33	4.92	532/1572	4.92	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	6	17	13	4.19	1001/1564	4.19	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	524/1559	4.66	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	4	9	22	4.42	389/1352	4.42	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	3	6	3	3.77	959/1384	3.77	4.11	4.08	4.11	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	855/1368	4.23	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	5	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.00	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	38	Non-major	19
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 382 0101
 Title INTRO INTERACTIVE MEDI
 Instructor: CRAWFORD, BONNI
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 141
 FEB 11, 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	2	0	9	4.64	471/1649	4.64	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	401/1648	4.64	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	133/1595	4.90	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	748/1533	4.10	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1149/1512	3.70	3.76	4.10	4.11	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	459/1623	4.55	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	664/1646	4.90	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	559/1621	4.36	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	0	2	7	4.18	1176/1568	4.18	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	1203/1572	4.55	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1219/1564	3.91	4.33	4.28	4.25	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	952/1559	4.27	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	172/1352	4.73	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	869/1382	4.20	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 384 0101
 Title INTRO 3D ANIMATION
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 142
 FEB 11, 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	186/1649	4.90	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	464/1375	4.60	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.60		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1010/1595	4.10	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1180/1533	3.60	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1320/1512	3.40	3.76	4.10	4.11	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	979/1623	4.10	3.94	4.16	4.08	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	456/1621	4.44	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	591/1572	4.90	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	780/1564	4.40	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1559	4.90	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	133/1352	4.80	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	645/ 948	3.67	3.97	3.95	4.00	3.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	4.20	3.68	3.58	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	16/ 312	4.71	4.40	3.68	3.60	4.71	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

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	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	1	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	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 387 0101
 Title: EXPRESSION TIME & MOTI
 Instructor: SHEPPARD, JENNY
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 143
 FEB 11, 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	0	5	2	1	2.82	1629/1649	2.91	4.29	4.28	4.27	2.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1587/1648	3.15	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1470/1595	3.47	4.24	4.20	4.21	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	5	2	3.50	1249/1533	2.97	3.87	4.04	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1505/1512	2.50	3.76	4.10	4.11	2.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	2	5	1	3.18	1501/1623	3.34	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1157/1646	4.52	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	1	6	1	0	2.45	1592/1621	2.89	4.12	4.06	4.02	2.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1411/1568	3.66	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1346/1572	4.53	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1267/1564	3.71	4.33	4.28	4.25	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	1	3.09	1469/1559	3.05	4.24	4.29	4.23	3.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	624/1352	3.91	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	795/1384	3.58	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	676/1382	4.47	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	0	0	7	4.11	915/1368	4.31	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	800/ 948	3.25	3.97	3.95	4.00	3.25	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.40	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
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
			? 2		

Course-Section: ART 387 0201
 Title: EXPRESSION TIME & MOTI
 Instructor: SHEPPARD, JENNY
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 144
 FEB 11, 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	2	0	4	4	0	3.00	1603/1649	2.91	4.29	4.28	4.27	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	0	3.20	1571/1648	3.15	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1372/1595	3.47	4.24	4.20	4.21	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	1	0	2	2.44	1515/1533	2.97	3.87	4.04	4.05	2.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1428/1512	2.50	3.76	4.10	4.11	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	3	1	3.50	1387/1623	3.34	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1193/1646	4.52	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	1429/1621	2.89	4.12	4.06	4.02	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1440/1568	3.66	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1034/1572	4.53	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1360/1564	3.71	4.33	4.28	4.25	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1479/1559	3.05	4.24	4.29	4.23	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	950/1352	3.91	4.38	3.98	3.97	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1224/1384	3.58	4.11	4.08	4.11	3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1382	4.47	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	654/1368	4.31	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 948	3.25	3.97	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	4.00	4.40	3.68	3.60	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 390 0101
 Title IRC FELLOWS TOPICS
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 145
 FEB 11, 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	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1594/1649	3.10	4.29	4.28	4.27	3.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	3	0	3.00	1591/1648	3.00	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	3	2	0	3.00	1537/1595	3.00	4.24	4.20	4.21	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1533	****	3.87	4.04	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1509/1512	1.60	3.76	4.10	4.11	1.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	5	0	0	1	0	1.50	1622/1623	1.50	3.94	4.16	4.08	1.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	3	5	2	0	2.90	1535/1621	2.90	4.12	4.06	4.02	2.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	3	0	1	3.00	1515/1568	3.00	4.35	4.43	4.39	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1365/1572	4.33	4.77	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1524/1564	2.83	4.33	4.28	4.25	2.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	2	0	2.86	1508/1559	2.86	4.24	4.29	4.23	2.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	6	0	3.57	1016/1352	3.57	4.38	3.98	3.97	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1069/1382	3.80	4.44	4.29	4.37	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	876/1368	4.20	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	894/ 948	2.75	3.97	3.95	4.00	2.75	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 392 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, JASO
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 146
 FEB 11, 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	0	2	9	4.82	265/1649	4.82	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	291/1648	4.73	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1375	4.40	4.50	4.27	4.22	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	815/1533	4.00	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	755/1512	4.20	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1241/1623	3.80	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	803/1568	4.55	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	822/1564	4.36	4.33	4.28	4.25	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	434/1559	4.73	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	101/1352	4.90	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	869/1382	4.20	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	876/1368	4.20	4.46	4.30	4.39	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.58	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	26/ 110	4.20	4.07	3.99	4.05	4.20	

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	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Non-major 4
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Electives	0
				Other	5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 392C 0101
 Title INNOVATION AND DESIGN
 Instructor: YAGER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 147
 FEB 11, 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	0	3	6	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.29	4.28	4.27	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	643/1648	4.44	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	580/1595	4.44	4.24	4.20	4.21	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1533	4.50	3.87	4.04	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.76	4.10	4.11	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1520/1623	3.11	3.94	4.16	4.08	3.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1419/1646	4.22	4.70	4.69	4.67	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	313/1621	4.57	4.12	4.06	4.02	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.35	4.43	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	110/1352	4.88	4.38	3.98	3.97	4.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	4.86	4.11	4.08	4.11	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	435/1382	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.37	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 948	4.17	3.97	3.95	4.00	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.67	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.61	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.75	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	58/ 288	4.33	4.20	3.68	3.58	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	21/ 312	4.67	4.40	3.68	3.60	4.67	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	5.00	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	84/ 110	3.83	4.07	3.99	4.05	3.83	

Course-Section: ART 392C 0101
 Title INNOVATION AND DESIGN
 Instructor: YAGER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 147
 FEB 11, 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	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	10	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 424 0101
 Title CONTEMP ART,THEORY, CR
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 148
 FEB 11, 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	0	6	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	999/1648	4.17	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	137/1533	4.83	3.87	4.04	4.14	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.76	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1623	4.67	3.94	4.16	4.27	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1462/1646	4.17	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1121/1568	4.25	4.35	4.43	4.54	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.44	4.29	4.56	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	844/1368	4.25	4.46	4.30	4.58	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 948	4.67	3.97	3.95	4.31	4.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.61	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	38/ 88	4.75	4.92	4.54	4.66	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	81/ 85	3.50	4.25	4.47	4.54	3.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	41/ 81	4.50	4.61	4.43	4.57	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 92	4.75	4.75	4.35	4.44	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.25	4.20	3.68	3.71	4.25	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 429 0101
 Title SEMINAR:ART HIST & THE
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 149
 FEB 11, 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	3	4.60	510/1649	4.60	4.29	4.28	4.50	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1285/1595	3.75	4.24	4.20	4.36	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.87	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	380/1512	4.50	3.76	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	1485/1623	3.25	3.94	4.16	4.27	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.35	4.43	4.54	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	550/1564	4.60	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	832/1559	4.40	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	376/1384	4.60	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.44	4.29	4.56	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	876/1368	4.20	4.46	4.30	4.58	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	901/ 948	2.67	3.97	3.95	4.31	2.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.98	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.92	4.54	4.66	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	62/ 85	4.25	4.25	4.47	4.54	4.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	51/ 81	4.33	4.61	4.43	4.57	4.33	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.75	4.35	4.44	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/ 288	4.75	4.20	3.68	3.71	4.75	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.95	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 430 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI
 Instructor: RE, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 150
 FEB 11, 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	1	8	18	4.63	484/1649	4.63	4.29	4.28	4.50	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	498/1648	4.56	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	271/1375	4.78	4.50	4.27	4.48	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	362/1595	4.63	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	16	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	604/1533	4.27	3.87	4.04	4.14	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	6	7	12	4.15	791/1512	4.15	3.76	4.10	4.26	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	5	7	10	3.85	1216/1623	3.85	3.94	4.16	4.27	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	993/1646	4.70	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	12	4.43	469/1621	4.43	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.35	4.43	4.54	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	486/1564	4.65	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	640/1559	4.55	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	418/1384	4.53	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.44	4.29	4.56	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	449/1368	4.73	4.46	4.30	4.58	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	97/ 948	4.86	3.97	3.95	4.31	4.86	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	21/ 312	4.67	4.40	3.68	3.95	4.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	10	D 0	Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	Electives 1
				I 0	Other 24
				? 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 431 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 151
 FEB 11, 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	2	0	0	0	4	3	18	4.56	563/1649	4.56	4.29	4.28	4.50	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	8	10	4.08	1076/1648	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	21	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	18	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1533	****	3.87	4.04	4.14	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	13	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1089/1512	3.80	3.76	4.10	4.26	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	2	1	4	8	2	6	3.38	1442/1623	3.38	3.94	4.16	4.27	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	13	10	4.43	1258/1646	4.43	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	5	2	13	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	1	4	2	8	4.13	1213/1568	4.13	4.35	4.43	4.54	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	690/1572	4.87	4.77	4.70	4.79	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	939/1564	4.25	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	1093/1559	4.06	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	3	3	2	2	0	5	3.17	1189/1352	3.17	4.38	3.98	4.07	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	2	1	9	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	593/1382	4.53	4.44	4.29	4.56	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.46	4.30	4.58	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 24
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 27	Non-major 3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 20		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 435A 0101
 Title REAL/ILLUS IN CON CINE
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 152
 FEB 11, 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	9	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.29	4.28	4.50	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	352/1595	4.64	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	303/1533	4.58	3.87	4.04	4.14	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	507/1512	4.42	3.76	4.10	4.26	4.42	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	416/1623	4.58	3.94	4.16	4.27	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	185/1621	4.73	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	803/1568	4.55	4.35	4.43	4.54	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	591/1572	4.91	4.77	4.70	4.79	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	253/1564	4.82	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	306/1559	4.82	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1384	4.78	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.44	4.29	4.56	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.97	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	41/ 312	4.33	4.40	3.68	3.95	4.33	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	24/ 110	4.33	4.07	3.99	4.22	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 447 0101
 Title SPECIAL FX & MOTION GF
 Instructor: DELANEY, RICK
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 153
 FEB 11, 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	1	0	2	11	4.64	459/1649	4.64	4.29	4.28	4.50	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	895/1533	3.92	3.87	4.04	4.14	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1512	****	3.76	4.10	4.26	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	696/1623	4.36	3.94	4.16	4.27	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1268/1646	4.43	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	789/1621	4.17	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	588/1568	4.69	4.35	4.43	4.54	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	876/1572	4.79	4.77	4.70	4.79	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	294/1564	4.79	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	536/1559	4.64	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	188/1352	4.69	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	886/1384	3.91	4.11	4.08	4.35	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	585/1382	4.55	4.44	4.29	4.56	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	0	8	4.45	703/1368	4.45	4.46	4.30	4.58	4.45	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.07	3.99	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 460 0101
 Title INSTALLATION ART
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 154
 FEB 11, 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	1	0	3.50	1498/1649	3.50	4.29	4.28	4.50	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1537/1595	3.00	4.24	4.20	4.36	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1441/1533	3.00	3.87	4.04	4.14	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1510/1512	1.50	3.76	4.10	4.26	1.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1599/1623	2.50	3.94	4.16	4.27	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1515/1568	3.00	4.35	4.43	4.54	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1556/1572	3.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1496/1564	3.00	4.33	4.28	4.40	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1557/1559	1.00	4.24	4.29	4.41	1.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1335/1352	2.00	4.38	3.98	4.07	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1286/1368	3.00	4.46	4.30	4.58	3.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.20	3.68	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 484 0201
 Title ADVNCD 3D CMPUTR ANIMA
 Instructor: BAILEY, DAN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 155
 FEB 11, 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	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	130/1649	4.94	4.29	4.28	4.50	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	103/1648	4.94	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.50	4.27	4.48	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	272/1595	4.71	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1533	4.60	3.87	4.04	4.14	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1512	****	3.76	4.10	4.26	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	296/1623	4.69	3.94	4.16	4.27	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1491/1646	4.13	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	75/1621	4.93	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	604/1568	4.69	4.35	4.43	4.54	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	113/1352	4.87	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	351/1384	4.64	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	749/1382	4.36	4.44	4.29	4.56	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	624/1368	4.55	4.46	4.30	4.58	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.31	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 2
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	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 16		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 486 0101
 Title ADV INTERACTIVE MEDIA
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 156
 FEB 11, 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	0	0	4	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	1.50	1529/1533	1.50	3.87	4.04	4.14	1.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1623	5.00	3.94	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1398/1646	4.25	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1121/1568	4.25	4.35	4.43	4.54	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.56	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.46	4.30	4.58	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	1
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: ART 489B 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECTS
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 157
 FEB 11, 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	1	5	6	4	3.81	1343/1649	3.81	4.29	4.28	4.50	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	658/1648	4.44	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	362/1595	4.63	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1017/1533	3.80	3.87	4.04	4.14	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	849/1512	4.07	3.76	4.10	4.26	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	1241/1623	3.80	3.94	4.16	4.27	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1447/1646	4.19	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	8	4	4.14	812/1621	4.14	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	1153/1568	4.21	4.35	4.43	4.54	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1146/1572	4.60	4.77	4.70	4.79	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1055/1564	4.13	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	1093/1559	4.07	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.38	3.98	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	478/1384	4.46	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	302/1382	4.85	4.44	4.29	4.56	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	415/1368	4.77	4.46	4.30	4.58	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.97	3.95	4.31	4.50	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.71	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	5	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	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 491 0103
 Title SPECIAL STUDIES
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 158
 FEB 11, 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	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.24	4.20	4.36	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	3.94	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.12	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.35	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.58	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.07	3.99	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0103
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 159
 FEB 11, 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	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.36	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	3.94	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.12	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1515/1568	3.00	4.35	4.43	4.54	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.33	4.28	4.40	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1479/1559	3.00	4.24	4.29	4.41	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.58	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	4.20	3.68	3.71	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 312	5.00	4.40	3.68	3.95	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0120
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 160
 FEB 11, 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	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.50	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.41	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0126
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 161
 FEB 11, 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	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	4.67	4.29	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.89	4.26	4.23	4.36	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.24	4.20	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.87	4.04	4.14	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.76	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	4.33	3.94	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1340/1646	4.78	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	914/1621	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.35	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.40	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	283/ 288	1.00	4.20	3.68	3.71	1.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	50/ 53	4.33	4.33	4.30	4.64	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0145
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 162
 FEB 11, 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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1183/1649	4.67	4.29	4.28	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	4.89	4.26	4.23	4.36	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1533/1623	4.33	3.94	4.16	4.27	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	4.78	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	914/1621	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.24	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	4.33	4.33	4.30	4.64	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.84	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0146
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 163
 FEB 11, 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	0	1	5.00	1/1649	4.67	4.29	4.28	4.50	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	4.89	4.26	4.23	4.36	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.76	4.10	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	4.33	3.94	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	4.78	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	4.33	4.12	4.06	4.24	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 53	4.33	4.33	4.30	4.64	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.84	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 610 0101
 Title IMAG. DIGITAL SEMINAR
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 164
 FEB 11, 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	0	4	3	4.00	1183/1649	4.00	4.29	4.28	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.50	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1285/1595	3.75	4.24	4.20	4.35	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.67	3.87	4.04	4.28	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	3.76	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	671/1623	4.38	3.94	4.16	4.29	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.35	4.43	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	665/1572	4.88	4.77	4.70	4.83	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	812/1564	4.38	4.33	4.28	4.41	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	303/1352	4.50	4.38	3.98	4.10	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	571/1384	4.38	4.11	4.08	4.30	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	521/1382	4.63	4.44	4.29	4.52	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.46	4.30	4.56	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	3.97	3.95	4.03	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	45/ 221	4.67	4.67	4.16	4.27	4.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.67	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.73	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.92	4.54	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 620 0101
 Title HIST I&D ARTS
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 165
 FEB 11, 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	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.29	4.28	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.50	4.27	4.44	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	4.83	4.24	4.20	4.35	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	137/1533	4.83	3.87	4.04	4.28	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	4.83	3.76	4.10	4.35	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	635/1623	4.40	3.94	4.16	4.29	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.12	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.35	4.43	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.38	3.98	4.10	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.11	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.83	4.44	4.29	4.52	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	281/ 948	4.40	3.97	3.95	4.03	4.40	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.98	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.20	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.40	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 638 0141
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 166
 FEB 11, 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	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.24	4.20	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.87	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	3.76	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	3.94	4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.81	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.35	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.11	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.97	3.95	4.03	5.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.66	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	4.20	3.68	3.87	4.00
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.40	3.68	3.83	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 640 0101
 Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 167
 FEB 11, 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	2	2	3.67	1429/1649	3.67	4.29	4.28	4.46	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	797/1648	4.33	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.24	4.20	4.35	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1338/1533	3.33	3.87	4.04	4.28	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1266/1512	3.50	3.76	4.10	4.35	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	321/1623	4.67	3.94	4.16	4.29	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.35	4.43	4.52	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.77	4.70	4.83	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.33	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1231/1559	3.83	4.24	4.29	4.41	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	860/1352	3.83	4.38	3.98	4.10	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.11	4.08	4.30	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.83	4.44	4.29	4.52	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.46	4.30	4.56	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.97	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.98	4.29	4.66	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	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: ART 740 0101
 Title ADV. I&D STUDIO
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 168
 FEB 11, 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	4	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.29	4.28	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.50	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.24	4.20	4.35	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	986/1533	3.83	3.87	4.04	4.28	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	782/1512	4.17	3.76	4.10	4.35	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	502/1623	4.50	3.94	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.12	4.06	4.20	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.35	4.43	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	376/1384	4.60	4.11	4.08	4.30	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.44	4.29	4.52	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.46	4.30	4.56	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.97	3.95	4.03	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.92	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.25	4.47	4.50	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.61	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.75	4.35	4.42	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	4.20	3.68	3.87	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.07	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 790 0126
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 169
 FEB 11, 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	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.29	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.26	4.23	4.34	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.24	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	3.87	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1266/1512	3.50	3.76	4.10	4.35	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1623	4.67	3.94	4.16	4.29	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.12	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.35	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.77	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.38	3.98	4.10	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1254/1384	3.00	4.11	4.08	4.30	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.46	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.97	3.95	4.03	5.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.98	4.29	4.66	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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