

Course-Section: ART 210 1
 Title Visual Concepts
 Instructor: Chan,Irene
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 65
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	11	1	3.63	1359/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	8	2	2	3.00	1463/1509	3.96	4.23	4.26	4.32	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1287	4.73	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	843/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	7	3	4	1	0	1.93	1403/1406	3.06	3.81	4.09	4.09	1.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	2	8	0	1	2.57	1368/1384	3.36	3.67	4.11	4.09	2.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	6	1	5	3	3.19	1385/1489	3.70	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	762/1506	4.91	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	6	5	0	3.15	1367/1463	3.87	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1185/1438	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	1060/1421	4.73	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	5	7	1	3.38	1313/1411	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.37	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	4	5	3.63	1234/1405	4.12	4.31	4.32	4.39	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	2	4	2	3	3.15	1102/1236	3.94	4.42	4.00	4.11	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	8	3	3.86	888/1260	3.92	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	974/1255	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	910/1258	4.42	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	610/ 873	3.73	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 7
84-150	0	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 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 210 2
 Title Visual Concepts
 Instructor: Moren,Lisa
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 66
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1072/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	932/1509	3.96	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	4.73	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	686/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1406	3.06	3.81	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	5	2	2	2.93	1339/1384	3.36	3.67	4.11	4.09	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	2	2	6	4	3.86	1141/1489	3.70	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	8	4	3.94	944/1463	3.87	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	762/1438	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	1014/1421	4.73	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	1020/1411	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	1047/1405	4.12	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	481/1236	3.94	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1034/1260	3.92	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	796/1255	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	660/1258	4.42	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	681/ 873	3.73	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

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	4	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	800/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1086/1509	3.96	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	9	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1287	4.73	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	770/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1406	3.06	3.81	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	3	3	4	1	3.27	1282/1384	3.36	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	1236/1489	3.70	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	4.91	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1036/1463	3.87	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	348/1438	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	933/1421	4.73	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	867/1411	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	798/1405	4.12	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	211/1236	3.94	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	746/1260	3.92	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	665/1255	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	792/1258	4.42	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	1	0	5	1	3.86	560/ 873	3.73	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.86
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors		11	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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		0				

Course-Section: ART 210 4
 Title Visual Concepts
 Instructor: Gardner, Symmes
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 68
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	551/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509	3.96	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	326/1287	4.73	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	96/1459	4.42	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	665/1406	3.06	3.81	4.09	4.09	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1384	3.36	3.67	4.11	4.09	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	917/1489	3.70	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	762/1506	4.91	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	3.87	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	545/1438	4.53	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.73	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1411	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	634/1405	4.12	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	853/1236	3.94	4.42	4.00	4.11	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	597/1260	3.92	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	443/1255	4.31	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.42	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 873	3.73	4.11	4.03	4.04	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	563/1509	4.59	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	201/1509	4.64	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	857/1287	4.32	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	280/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	7	4	2	3.33	1258/1406	3.79	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	9	3	2	3.50	1192/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	513/1489	4.32	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1325/1506	4.36	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	381/1463	4.43	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	363/1438	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	243/1411	4.68	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	285/1405	4.65	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	100/1236	4.72	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	582/1260	4.49	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1255	4.68	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	236/1258	4.81	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	600/ 873	3.90	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.78
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	3.67	3.67	4.26	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 0						

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	4	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	953/1509	4.59	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	116/1509	4.64	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	803/1287	4.32	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.30	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1001/1406	3.79	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	4	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	807/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	243/1489	4.32	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1349/1506	4.36	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	410/1463	4.43	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	497/1438	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1411	4.68	4.31	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	273/1405	4.65	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	67/1236	4.72	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	308/1260	4.49	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1255	4.68	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1258	4.81	4.47	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	209/ 873	3.90	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	4.25	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	4.75	4.75	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	4.67	4.67	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	3.67	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****

Course-Section: ART 211 2
 Title Visual Concepts II/Cam
 Instructor: Thompson, Calla
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 70
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	9	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	201/1509	4.59	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	459/1509	4.64	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	491/1287	4.32	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	302/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	5	5	3.79	1023/1406	3.79	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1076/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1082/1489	4.32	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1014/1506	4.36	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	511/1463	4.43	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	617/1438	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	665/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1411	4.68	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	393/1405	4.65	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	187/1236	4.72	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	520/1260	4.49	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	494/1255	4.68	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	312/1258	4.81	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	442/ 873	3.90	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	4.25	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	4.67	4.67	4.18	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	Major 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	General 0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Under-grad 15
				P 0	Non-major 6
				I 0	Electives 3
				? 1	Other 1
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 211 4
 Title Visual Concepts II/Cam
 Instructor: Silberg, Steven
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 72
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	4	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	446/1509	4.59	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	838/1509	4.64	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	739/1287	4.32	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	410/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1159/1406	3.79	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1036/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	906/1489	4.32	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1030/1506	4.36	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	545/1463	4.43	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1438	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	933/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	943/1411	4.68	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	798/1405	4.65	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	392/1236	4.72	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	415/1260	4.49	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	412/1255	4.68	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	792/1258	4.81	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	705/ 873	3.90	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 211 5
 Title Visual Concepts II/Cam
 Instructor: Farrell,John
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 73
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1509	4.59	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	390/1509	4.64	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	638/1287	4.32	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	146/1459	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/1406	3.79	3.81	4.09	4.09	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	0	4	3.56	1168/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	597/1489	4.32	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.36	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	294/1463	4.43	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1438	4.72	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1411	4.68	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	596/1405	4.65	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	67/1236	4.72	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	352/1260	4.49	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	749/1255	4.68	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1258	4.81	4.47	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	630/ 873	3.90	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	19/ 48	4.75	4.75	4.39	4.79	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	32/ 48	4.25	4.25	4.41	4.50	4.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	23/ 47	4.75	4.75	4.51	4.83	4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47	4.67	4.67	4.18	4.56	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 44	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.67	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	42/ 49	3.67	3.67	4.26	4.33	3.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	31/ 46	4.00	4.00	4.31	4.00	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: ART 211 5
 Title Visual Concepts II/Cam
 Instructor: Farrell,John
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 73
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	8	Required for Majors	11	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	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
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 212 1
 Title Visual Concepts III/3D
 Instructor: Young, Shannon
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 74
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	4	0	0	0	4	4	3	3.91	1214/1509	3.91	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1221/1509	3.90	4.23	4.26	4.32	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	715/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1406	3.23	3.81	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	5	4	0	2	0	0	1.67	1384/1384	2.54	3.67	4.11	4.09	1.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1169/1489	3.82	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	1	3.90	983/1463	3.84	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1166/1438	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1195/1421	4.52	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1153/1411	4.06	4.31	4.31	4.37	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1047/1405	3.89	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	489/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	701/1260	4.05	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1255	4.41	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	535/1258	4.39	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	3.83	4.11	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			Non-major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P 0			
				I 0	Other	0	
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 212 2
 Title Visual Concepts III/3D
 Instructor: Young, Shannon
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 75
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	5	3	1	3.40	1425/1509	3.91	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	5	0	0	2.40	1502/1509	3.90	4.23	4.26	4.32	2.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1271/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1369/1406	3.23	3.81	4.09	4.09	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	5	1	1	0	1	1.88	1383/1384	2.54	3.67	4.11	4.09	1.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	1	4	3	1	0	2.44	1470/1489	3.82	3.97	4.17	4.19	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	4	2	0	2.70	1432/1463	3.84	4.12	4.09	4.08	2.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1358/1438	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.48	3.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1345/1421	4.52	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	2	4	0	2.80	1386/1411	4.06	4.31	4.31	4.37	2.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	0	2	3	2	3.10	1341/1405	3.89	4.31	4.32	4.39	3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	984/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.11	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	958/1260	4.05	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	851/1255	4.41	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1193/1258	4.39	4.47	4.38	4.44	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 873	3.83	4.11	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 4	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 12	Non-major 4
84-150	0	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 212 3
 Title Visual Concepts III/3D
 Instructor: Shiflet,Nicole
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 76
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	5	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	482/1509	3.91	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1509	3.90	4.23	4.26	4.32	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	247/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1128/1406	3.23	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	3	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	978/1384	2.54	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	3.82	3.97	4.17	4.19	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	271/1463	3.84	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1438	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	4.52	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1411	4.06	4.31	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	788/1405	3.89	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	126/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	370/1260	4.05	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	4.41	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.39	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	585/ 873	3.83	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 9	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 6
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	0		
				? 1				

Course-Section: ART 212 4
 Title Visual Concepts III/3D
 Instructor: Shiflet,Nicole
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 77
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1314/1509	3.91	4.34	4.31	4.34	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	742/1509	3.90	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	313/1459	4.31	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1276/1406	3.23	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	0	2	2	2.78	1356/1384	2.54	3.67	4.11	4.09	2.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	986/1489	3.82	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	690/1463	3.84	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1049/1421	4.52	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	568/1411	4.06	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	6	4.09	1005/1405	3.89	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	193/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	924/1260	4.05	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1001/1255	4.41	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	398/1258	4.39	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	560/ 873	3.83	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.86
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 213 1
 Title Visual Concepts IV/4D
 Instructor: Valiente,Christ
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 78
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	942/1509	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1013/1509	4.35	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	280/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1140/1406	3.67	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	589/1384	3.89	3.67	4.11	4.09	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	1106/1489	4.07	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1222/1506	4.52	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	853/1463	4.28	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	1203/1438	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	846/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	810/1411	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	708/1405	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	73/1236	4.87	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	701/1260	4.22	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	344/1255	4.64	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	620/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 873	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 8	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 1	Under-grad 10	Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 213 2
 Title Visual Concepts IV/4D
 Instructor: Nohe, Timothy
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 79
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	2	8	4.08	1065/1509	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	507/1509	4.35	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	335/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	446/1406	3.67	3.81	4.09	4.09	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1384	3.89	3.67	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	986/1489	4.07	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1258/1506	4.52	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	248/1463	4.28	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	497/1438	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	483/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	520/1411	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	459/1405	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	67/1236	4.87	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	505/1260	4.22	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	749/1255	4.64	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	570/ 873	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.83
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	0	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 3
 Title Visual Concepts IV/4D
 Instructor: Mayhew, James
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 80
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	244/1509	4.36	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	699/1509	4.35	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	803/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	7	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1333/1406	3.67	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1192/1384	3.89	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	707/1489	4.07	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	4.52	4.60	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.28	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	737/1438	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	846/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	279/1411	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	587/1405	4.56	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	100/1236	4.87	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	701/1260	4.22	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.64	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	4.42	4.11	4.03	4.04	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 214 1
 Title Drawing I
 Instructor: Shafie,Hadih M
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 81
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1044/1509	4.41	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	0	5	3.60	1331/1509	4.22	4.23	4.26	4.32	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1111/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406	2.60	3.81	4.09	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	0	2	1	2.44	1470/1489	3.33	3.97	4.17	4.19	2.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1346/1506	4.10	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1241/1463	3.99	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1353/1438	4.08	4.38	4.46	4.48	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1162/1421	4.68	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	1157/1411	4.34	4.31	4.31	4.37	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1265/1405	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.39	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1236	4.21	4.42	4.00	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	936/1260	4.16	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.47	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	620/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	698/1509	4.41	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	828/1509	4.22	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	792/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1389/1406	2.60	3.81	4.09	4.09	2.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	4	2	2	2	2.83	1430/1489	3.33	3.97	4.17	4.19	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	11	2	4.00	1383/1506	4.10	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	628/1463	3.99	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1182/1438	4.08	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	1138/1421	4.68	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	580/1411	4.34	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	859/1405	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	883/1236	4.21	4.42	4.00	4.11	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	597/1260	4.16	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	762/1255	4.47	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1083/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.44	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	610/ 873	3.82	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
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 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 214 3
 Title Drawing I
 Instructor: Shellow, Leslie
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 83
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1509	4.41	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	223/1509	4.22	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	378/1459	4.23	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1406	2.60	3.81	4.09	4.09	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	3	4	3.71	1076/1384	3.71	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	224/1489	3.33	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1287/1506	4.10	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	7	6	4.21	668/1463	3.99	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	762/1438	4.08	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	4.68	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	482/1411	4.34	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	333/1405	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	142/1236	4.21	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	460/1260	4.16	4.18	4.14	4.19	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	474/1255	4.47	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	545/ 873	3.82	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.89

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	28	0	3	6	13	31	52	4.17	964/1509	4.17	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	28	0	3	6	23	20	53	4.09	1027/1509	4.09	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	30	81	1	4	4	12	4.14	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.30	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	27	15	5	6	12	16	52	4.14	877/1459	4.14	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	29	21	3	3	17	20	40	4.10	746/1406	4.10	3.81	4.09	4.09	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	27	4	2	7	20	23	50	4.10	756/1384	4.10	3.67	4.11	4.09	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	28	2	2	5	18	18	60	4.25	760/1489	4.25	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	27	2	1	0	0	9	94	4.88	642/1506	4.88	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	38	4	1	3	12	36	39	4.20	690/1463	4.20	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	28	0	0	0	6	12	87	4.77	413/1438	4.77	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	28	0	0	1	5	12	87	4.76	863/1421	4.76	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	29	0	3	2	10	10	79	4.54	580/1411	4.54	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	29	1	3	5	10	11	74	4.44	720/1405	4.44	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	31	0	0	2	6	6	88	4.76	121/1236	4.76	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	60	0	8	6	16	13	30	3.70	968/1260	3.70	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	59	0	5	6	12	18	33	3.92	983/1255	3.92	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	59	0	3	0	11	13	47	4.36	749/1258	4.36	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	59	55	4	1	3	3	8	3.53	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	131	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	130	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	131	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	131	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	****	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	131	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	130	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	131	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	132	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	65
28-55	17	1.00-1.99	0	B	30
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	3
			Required for Majors	81	Graduate
			General	4	Under-grad
			Electives	9	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			Other	2	

Course-Section: ART 220 1
 Title Art History I
 Instructor: Feldman,Joan S
 Enrollment: 127
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 85
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	6	21	43	4.41	711/1509	4.41	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	8	19	44	4.42	667/1509	4.42	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	3	19	47	45	4.55	481/1287	4.55	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	2	2	9	26	29	4.15	877/1459	4.15	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	3	5	12	18	27	3.94	897/1406	3.94	3.81	4.09	4.09	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	5	15	25	22	3.87	970/1384	3.87	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	3	10	16	40	4.30	707/1489	4.30	3.97	4.17	4.19	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	9	60	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	1	7	30	21	4.20	678/1463	4.20	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	18	52	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	67	4.92	483/1421	4.92	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	4	25	39	4.36	779/1411	4.36	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	3	16	48	4.53	615/1405	4.53	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	2	11	54	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	4	10	12	20	3.98	782/1260	3.98	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.98
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	1	10	13	22	4.15	851/1255	4.15	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.15
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	1	1	5	10	30	4.43	700/1258	4.43	4.47	4.38	4.44	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	29	33	4	3	5	1	0	2.23	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	72	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	72	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	72	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	72	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	70	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	70	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	70	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	71	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.56	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	72	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	72	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	72	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	72	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****

Course-Section: ART 220 1
 Title Art History I
 Instructor: Feldman,Joan S
 Enrollment: 127
 Questionnaires: 75

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 85
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	36	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	26	Under-grad	75	Non-major	55
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 221 1
 Title Art History II
 Instructor: Ottesen, Bodil B
 Enrollment: 121
 Questionnaires: 117

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 86
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	30	0	2	1	19	29	36	4.10	1044/1509	4.10	4.34	4.31	4.34	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	30	0	1	6	20	41	19	3.82	1221/1509	3.82	4.23	4.26	4.32	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	30	1	0	6	15	35	30	4.03	911/1287	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.03
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	31	6	2	5	16	37	20	3.85	1127/1459	3.85	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	30	1	3	7	11	27	38	4.05	783/1406	4.05	3.81	4.09	4.09	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	31	2	3	3	21	33	24	3.86	978/1384	3.86	3.67	4.11	4.09	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	31	1	2	1	26	29	27	3.92	1094/1489	3.92	3.97	4.17	4.19	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	30	2	0	0	0	15	70	4.82	742/1506	4.82	4.60	4.67	4.61	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	46	2	0	0	16	45	8	3.88	998/1463	3.88	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	35	0	0	0	7	22	53	4.56	725/1438	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.48	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	33	0	0	1	0	8	75	4.87	639/1421	4.87	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	36	0	0	2	13	37	29	4.15	971/1411	4.15	4.31	4.31	4.37	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	1	11	19	52	4.47	683/1405	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	32	3	1	2	9	13	57	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.42	4.00	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	66	0	8	7	12	13	11	3.24	1125/1260	3.24	4.18	4.14	4.19	3.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	67	0	8	6	18	8	10	3.12	1198/1255	3.12	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.12
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	67	0	4	3	13	17	13	3.64	1110/1258	3.64	4.47	4.38	4.44	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	67	38	4	0	5	0	3	2.83	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	107	8	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	108	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	108	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	109	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	108	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	108	3	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	108	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	109	1	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	109	3	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	109	2	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	109	0	1	1	4	0	2	3.13	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	109	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	110	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	109	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	108	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	110	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	108	5	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	109	4	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	108	7	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	108	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: ART 221 1
 Title Art History II
 Instructor: Ottesen, Bodil B
 Enrollment: 121
 Questionnaires: 117

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 86
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	3	A	29	Required for Majors	45	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	43						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	12	General	29	Under-grad	117	Non-major	82
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 305 1
 Title Film I: Moving Images
 Instructor: Worden, Frederic
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 87
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	483/1509	4.56	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1406	****	3.81	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1132/1384	3.63	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	760/1489	4.25	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	642/1506	4.88	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	689/1411	4.44	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1405	4.78	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	73/1236	4.89	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1260	****	4.18	4.14	4.22	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1255	****	4.41	4.33	4.37	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1258	****	4.47	4.38	4.42	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General		0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	1	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 315 1
 Title Video I
 Instructor: Grabill, Vincent
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 88
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1387/1509	3.55	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1221/1509	3.82	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1069/1287	3.82	4.39	4.30	4.33	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	0	6	2	3.80	1167/1459	3.80	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	1303/1406	3.18	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	3	1	2	2	0	2.38	1378/1384	2.38	3.67	4.11	4.15	2.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1169/1489	3.82	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	3	4	1	3.30	1323/1463	3.30	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1032/1438	4.30	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1000/1411	4.10	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1241/1405	3.60	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1021/1260	3.57	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	851/1255	4.14	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 315 1
 Title Video I
 Instructor: Grabill, Vincent
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 88
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 320 1
 Title Intro To Printmaking
 Instructor: Custen, Calvin R
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 89
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	3	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	540/1509	4.56	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1509	4.63	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1141/1489	3.86	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.89	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	712/1438	4.57	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	532/1411	4.57	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	228/1405	4.86	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.42	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	487/1260	4.43	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	390/1255	4.71	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	570/1258	4.57	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 320 1
 Title Intro To Printmaking
 Instructor: Custen, Calvin R
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 89
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 323 1
 Title 20Th Century Art
 Instructor: Fagan,Robert J.
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 90
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	6	31	4.65	422/1509	4.54	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	33	4.80	201/1509	4.59	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	9	30	4.77	250/1287	4.72	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	4	7	20	4.44	569/1459	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	14	23	4.47	366/1406	4.41	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	7	7	23	4.31	570/1384	4.15	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	34	4.72	216/1489	4.38	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	12	26	4.64	957/1506	4.61	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	8	25	4.66	216/1463	4.48	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	33	4.82	348/1438	4.85	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	35	4.87	639/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	6	32	4.74	315/1411	4.62	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	30	4.74	369/1405	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	60/1236	4.82	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	4	8	16	4.23	637/1260	4.24	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	4	4	20	4.48	593/1255	4.44	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	1	5	23	4.67	507/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	10	23	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 873	3.79	4.11	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 323 1
 Title 20Th Century Art
 Instructor: Fagan, Robert J.
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 90
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	10	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	7	General	1	Under-grad	40	Non-major	8
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 323 2
 Title 20Th Century Art
 Instructor: Jacob, Preminda
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 91
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	13	12	4.42	698/1509	4.54	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	720/1509	4.59	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	348/1287	4.72	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	8	13	4.23	792/1459	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	8	15	4.35	494/1406	4.41	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	4	4	3	12	4.00	807/1384	4.15	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	3	7	12	4.04	965/1489	4.38	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	1014/1506	4.61	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	579/1463	4.48	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	247/1438	4.85	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	429/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	617/1411	4.62	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	333/1405	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	137/1236	4.82	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	621/1260	4.24	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	665/1255	4.44	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	363/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	4	2	3	9	3.79	595/ 873	3.79	4.11	4.03	4.08	3.79

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 13			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 26	Non-major 12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	21	0	1	2	8	10	15	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	21	0	2	3	8	11	12	3.78	1246/1509	3.78	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	21	0	3	0	9	9	15	3.92	1010/1287	3.92	4.39	4.30	4.33	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	22	23	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	****/1459	****	4.32	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	4	13	19	4.42	434/1406	4.42	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	21	24	2	0	4	3	3	3.42	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	22	0	2	1	3	8	21	4.29	728/1489	4.29	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	22	1	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	742/1506	4.82	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	26	0	2	1	5	19	4	3.71	1142/1463	3.71	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	0	1	7	26	4.74	480/1438	4.74	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	0	2	2	30	4.82	742/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	0	0	5	15	14	4.26	876/1411	4.26	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	8	12	13	4.09	1010/1405	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	23	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	40/1236	4.94	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.94
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	40	0	6	3	3	2	3	2.59	1238/1260	2.59	4.18	4.14	4.22	2.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	42	0	5	2	6	0	2	2.47	1243/1255	2.47	4.41	4.33	4.37	2.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	42	0	3	0	7	0	5	3.27	1197/1258	3.27	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	41	14	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	54	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	54	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	54	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 12	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 6	General 6	Under-grad 57	Non-major 43
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 4			

Course-Section: ART 331 1
 Title Graph Des I: Image, Si
 Instructor: Abraham, Guenet
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 93
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	3	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1114/1509	3.84	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	5	9	2	3.53	1363/1509	3.48	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1287	2.75	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	0	4	6	7	4.00	979/1459	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	12	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	16	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	4	7	3	1	2.72	1441/1489	2.72	3.97	4.17	4.14	2.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	8	10	4.47	1098/1506	4.33	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	8	5	4	3.76	1092/1463	3.63	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	4	9	3	3.67	1343/1438	3.71	4.38	4.46	4.43	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	18	4.84	691/1421	4.67	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	4	3	8	3	3.56	1266/1411	3.53	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	3	6	6	3.78	1185/1405	3.76	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	2	3	5	6	3.61	930/1236	3.49	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	718/1260	4.04	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	443/1255	4.48	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	770/1258	4.22	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	10	9	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 873	2.80	4.11	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	1	7	3.69	1330/1509	3.84	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	6	2	5	3.44	1394/1509	3.48	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1279/1287	2.75	4.39	4.30	4.33	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1159/1459	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1406	4.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	3	4	3	2	2	2.71	1442/1489	2.72	3.97	4.17	4.14	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	9	6	4.19	1305/1506	4.33	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	4	0	6	3.50	1241/1463	3.63	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	2	1	6	3.75	1315/1438	3.71	4.38	4.46	4.43	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	1162/1421	4.67	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	0	2	2	5	3.50	1277/1411	3.53	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	1191/1405	3.76	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	0	1	3	2	3.38	1042/1236	3.49	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	746/1260	4.04	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	749/1255	4.48	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	901/1258	4.22	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	842/ 873	2.80	4.11	4.03	4.08	2.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 332 1
 Title Design & Tech I: Print
 Instructor: Cordova,Viviana
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 95
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	3	2	8	2	3.60	1369/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	4	2	3.27	1432/1509	3.91	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1249/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	5	5	1	3.21	1295/1406	3.56	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	3	2	3	1	2.67	1366/1384	2.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	3	5	1	2	2	2.62	1457/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1330/1506	4.40	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	9	0	0	2.67	1434/1463	3.74	4.12	4.09	4.08	2.67

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	5	1	3.31	1391/1438	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.43	3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	1282/1421	4.65	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	5	3	2	3.14	1348/1411	3.94	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	3	6	1	1	2.83	1373/1405	3.98	4.31	4.32	4.32	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	752/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.93

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1063/1260	4.08	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	3	2	6	3.77	1050/1255	4.29	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	2	1	1	8	4.00	932/1258	4.43	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	866/ 873	3.39	4.11	4.03	4.08	2.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	3
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	Other	0				
				?	0						

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	3	0	4	8	3.76	1301/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	7	3	3.53	1363/1509	3.91	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	938/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	4	0	6	3.25	1283/1406	3.56	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	3	4	2	2	2.92	1339/1384	2.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	2.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	2	8	2	3.41	1339/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1194/1506	4.40	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	1230/1463	3.74	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	4	4	5	3.80	1297/1438	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.43	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	1162/1421	4.65	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	7	4	3.73	1211/1411	3.94	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1047/1405	3.98	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	664/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	746/1260	4.08	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	681/1255	4.29	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	792/1258	4.43	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	650/ 873	3.39	4.11	4.03	4.08	3.67
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	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	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	551/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	838/1509	3.91	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	770/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1178/1406	3.56	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1384	2.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	986/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	941/1506	4.40	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	690/1463	3.74	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	930/1438	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	537/1421	4.65	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1005/1411	3.94	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	940/1405	3.98	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	314/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	701/1260	4.08	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	851/1255	4.29	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	700/1258	4.43	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.39	4.11	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 10	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 1				

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	410/1509	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	483/1509	3.91	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	191/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	551/1406	3.56	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	2.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	674/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1127/1506	4.40	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	271/1463	3.74	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	247/1438	4.10	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/1421	4.65	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	279/1411	3.94	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	194/1405	3.98	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	126/1236	4.28	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	244/1260	4.08	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.29	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	4.43	4.47	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	209/ 873	3.39	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 333 2
 Title Typography I
 Instructor: Campbell, Susan
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 99
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	306/1406	4.55	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	299/1384	4.57	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	216/1489	4.73	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1243/1506	4.27	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.31	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1260	4.86	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 334 1
 Title Graphic Design IV
 Instructor: Bell, Kathryn L
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 100
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1509	4.01	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	300/1509	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	86/1459	4.05	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1384	3.67	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	513/1489	4.03	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1287/1506	4.06	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	118/1463	3.98	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	348/1438	3.74	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	4.57	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	339/1411	3.95	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	596/1405	3.77	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	474/1236	4.27	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	136/1260	4.03	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1255	4.07	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	350/1258	4.05	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	2
84-150	4	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 334 2
 Title Graphic Design IV
 Instructor: Coates, Joseph M
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 101
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	5	0	2	0	3	3	2	3.30	1440/1509	4.01	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1228/1509	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1058/1287	3.83	4.39	4.30	4.33	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	3	1	5	1	3.18	1399/1459	4.05	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1107/1384	3.67	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1263/1489	4.03	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1448/1506	4.06	4.60	4.67	4.67	3.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1364/1463	3.98	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1425/1438	3.74	4.38	4.46	4.43	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1322/1421	4.57	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1346/1411	3.95	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1348/1405	3.77	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1236	4.27	4.42	4.00	4.07	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1142/1260	4.03	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	0	1	3	1	3.14	1195/1255	4.07	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	1193/1258	4.05	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 873	4.50	4.11	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	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	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 335 1
 Title Graphic Design V
 Instructor: Smalls,James
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 102
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	9	0	0	1	3	9	14	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	2	6	6	12	3.96	1117/1509	3.96	4.23	4.26	4.25	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	1	1	4	12	9	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	2	2	5	9	8	3.73	1202/1459	3.73	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	1	2	0	3	11	10	4.04	790/1406	4.04	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	4	7	7	6	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	3	3	4	9	8	3.59	1267/1489	3.59	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	3	15	9	4.22	1280/1506	4.22	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	2	0	4	10	4	3.70	1142/1463	3.70	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.70

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	0	5	21	4.70	531/1438	4.70	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	1	1	2	5	18	4.41	1217/1421	4.41	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	2	4	8	12	4.04	1035/1411	4.04	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	9	13	4.19	947/1405	4.19	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	2	0	1	4	15	4.36	392/1236	4.36	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.36

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	4	1	3	4	4	3.19	1136/1260	3.19	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	2	4	5	3	3.31	1171/1255	3.31	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	3	1	5	2	5	3.31	1188/1258	3.31	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.31
4. Were special techniques successful	20	13	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 336 1
 Title Design & Tech II: Scre
 Instructor: Bell, Kathryn L
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 103
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1509	4.46	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	605/1509	4.46	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1101/1287	3.73	4.39	4.30	4.33	3.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	520/1459	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	1	3	3.31	1267/1406	3.31	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1132/1384	3.63	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1156/1506	4.42	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1179/1438	4.08	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1099/1421	4.58	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1135/1411	3.92	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	1	8	4.08	1010/1405	4.08	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	496/1260	4.42	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	656/1255	4.42	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	317/ 873	4.29	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 13	Non-major 2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 341 1
 Title Intro To Animation
 Instructor: Dyer, Eric
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 104
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	992/1509	4.13	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	708/1287	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1111/1459	3.88	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1213/1406	3.44	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1017/1384	3.80	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	906/1489	4.11	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	904/1438	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	713/1411	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	974/1405	4.14	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	466/1236	4.29	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	681/1260	4.17	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 342 1
 Title Film/Video Theory & Cr
 Instructor: Worden, Frederic
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 105
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	862/1509	4.27	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	838/1509	4.27	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	578/1287	4.45	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	843/1459	4.18	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	389/1406	4.45	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	492/1384	4.36	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	216/1489	4.73	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1118/1506	4.45	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	235/1463	4.63	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	1055/1438	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	568/1411	4.55	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	381/1405	4.73	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	142/1236	4.73	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	582/1260	4.30	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	486/1258	4.70	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	394/ 873	4.14	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 9	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3				
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 11	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 1				
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	0		
				? 1				

Course-Section: ART 346 1
 Title Video II
 Instructor: Sheppard, Jenny
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 106
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1509	4.25	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	587/1406	4.25	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	986/1489	4.00	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 347 1
 Title Writing For Media Arts
 Instructor: Cook,Cathy
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 107
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	605/1509	4.46	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	304/1287	4.71	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	693/1406	4.15	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	123/1384	4.79	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	802/1489	4.21	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1014/1506	4.57	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	1055/1438	4.27	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	779/1411	4.36	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	798/1405	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	392/1236	4.36	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14	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	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 360 1
 Title Mixed Media Book Arts
 Instructor: Chan,Irene
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 108
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1392/1406	2.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1366/1384	2.67	3.67	4.11	4.15	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1391/1489	3.14	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1146/1506	4.43	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1168/1463	3.67	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1235/1411	3.67	4.31	4.31	4.29	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1334/1405	3.17	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1133/1260	3.20	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	822/1255	4.20	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1126/1258	3.60	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.08	****

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 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 9	Non-major 4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 361 1
 Title Digital Darkroom
 Instructor: Thompson,Calla
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 109
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	470/1509	4.62	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	720/1509	4.38	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	6	3	3.92	921/1406	3.92	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1089/1384	3.69	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	513/1489	4.46	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	579/1463	4.31	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	497/1438	4.73	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	456/1411	4.64	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	596/1405	4.55	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	248/1236	4.55	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	330/1260	4.64	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	620/1255	4.45	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	456/1258	4.73	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	Under-grad 14	Non-major 1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 363 1
 Title Color Photography
 Instructor: Peregoy,Christo
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 110
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	339/1509	4.73	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	495/1509	4.55	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	96/1459	4.90	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1225/1406	3.43	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.67	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	243/1489	4.70	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1300/1506	4.20	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	737/1438	4.56	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1411	4.90	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	321/1405	4.78	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	67/1236	4.90	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	287/1260	4.70	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	236/1258	4.90	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 364 1
 Title Studio Photography
 Instructor: Durant, Mark R
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 111
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	528/1509	4.56	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	652/1509	4.44	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	302/1459	4.64	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1406	****	3.81	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	7	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	175/1489	4.78	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	114/1463	4.82	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	514/1438	4.71	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	201/1411	4.85	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	309/1405	4.79	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	126/1236	4.75	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0	Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 367 1
 Title Alternative Processes
 Instructor: Peregoy,Christo
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 112
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	116/1509	4.90	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	400/1406	4.44	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	1311/1384	3.11	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	630/1489	4.38	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.90	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	607/1236	4.11	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	383/1260	4.56	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 370 1
 Title Silkscreen Printing
 Instructor: Chan,Irene
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 113
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	374/1509	4.70	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1108/1287	3.70	4.39	4.30	4.33	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	911/1459	4.10	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1296/1384	3.20	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	5	1	3.50	1303/1489	3.50	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	917/1506	4.70	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.25

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1107/1421	4.57	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	974/1405	4.14	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1088/1236	3.20	4.42	4.00	4.07	3.20

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	936/1260	3.75	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1070/1258	3.75	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	861/ 873	2.33	4.11	4.03	4.08	2.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 380 1
 Title Hist & Theory Of Games
 Instructor: McDonald,David
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 114
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	9	16	4.15	998/1509	4.15	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	13	17	4.38	720/1509	4.38	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	21	4.59	444/1287	4.59	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	19	4.41	602/1459	4.41	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	11	17	4.18	674/1406	4.18	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	10	13	3.91	925/1384	3.91	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	6	9	15	4.09	923/1489	4.09	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	19	4.53	1054/1506	4.53	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	7	7	12	4.19	690/1463	4.19	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	5	13	15	4.30	1032/1438	4.30	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	28	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	7	20	4.42	713/1411	4.42	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	9	20	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	8	24	4.70	158/1236	4.70	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	3	2	7	8	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	707/1255	4.35	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.35
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	2	1	4	13	4.40	261/ 873	4.40	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors 24	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 34 Non-major 24
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 382 1
 Title Intro Interactive Medi
 Instructor: Smith,Ryan
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 115
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	698/1509	4.53	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	667/1509	4.28	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	326/1287	4.41	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	667/1459	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1116/1406	3.63	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1069/1384	3.70	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	937/1489	3.91	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	4.94	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	809/1463	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	981/1438	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	1206/1421	4.59	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	789/1411	4.18	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	733/1405	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	110/1236	4.46	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	637/1260	3.78	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	611/1255	3.98	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	598/1258	4.02	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	442/ 873	3.63	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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 382 2
 Title Intro Interactive Medi
 Instructor: Hartley,Tronste
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 116
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	458/1509	4.53	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	992/1509	4.28	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	869/1287	4.41	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	686/1459	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	3	3.63	1128/1406	3.63	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1107/1384	3.70	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1197/1489	3.91	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	642/1506	4.94	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1133/1463	3.90	4.12	4.09	4.08	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	800/1438	4.43	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	881/1421	4.59	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1051/1411	4.18	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1191/1405	4.09	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	598/1236	4.46	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1102/1260	3.78	4.18	4.14	4.22	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1127/1255	3.98	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1143/1258	4.02	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	771/ 873	3.63	4.11	4.03	4.08	3.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 382 2
 Title Intro Interactive Medi
 Instructor: Hartley,Tronste
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 116
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	8	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 383 1
 Title Sound Design
 Instructor: Bradley, Stephen
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 117
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	3	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	833/1509	4.31	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	720/1509	4.38	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	247/1459	4.69	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	6	3	2	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1226/1384	3.43	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	986/1489	4.00	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1108/1506	4.46	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	815/1463	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	90/1236	4.83	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	287/1260	4.70	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	412/1255	4.70	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	486/1258	4.70	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 384 1
 Title Intro 3D Animation
 Instructor: Zuber,James R
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 118
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	104/1509	4.92	4.23	4.26	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	444/1287	4.58	4.39	4.30	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	332/1406	4.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	2	2	5	3.75	1050/1384	3.75	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.97	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	608/1463	4.27	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	700/1438	4.58	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	568/1411	4.55	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1405	4.92	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 387 2
 Title Expression Time & Moti
 Instructor: Dyer, Eric
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 119
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	111/1459	4.88	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	458/1489	4.50	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1258/1506	4.25	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	646/1438	4.63	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	513/1405	4.63	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.88	4.41	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	535/1258	4.63	4.47	4.38	4.42	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	4
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		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ART 390 1
 Title IRC Fellows Topics
 Instructor: Nohe, Timothy
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 120
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1002/1509	4.11	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	823/1489	4.20	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.12	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.07	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.18	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 395 1
 Title Television Production
 Instructor: Shewbridge,Will
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 121
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	862/1509	4.27	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	495/1509	4.55	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.33	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	834/1459	4.20	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	665/1406	4.18	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1217/1384	3.44	3.67	4.11	4.15	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1106/1489	3.91	3.97	4.17	4.14	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	804/1463	4.09	4.12	4.09	4.08	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1147/1438	4.14	4.38	4.46	4.43	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	950/1421	4.71	4.77	4.73	4.73	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.29	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1154/1405	3.86	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	354/1236	4.40	4.42	4.00	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1246/1260	2.40	4.18	4.14	4.22	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1187/1255	3.20	4.41	4.33	4.37	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1126/1258	3.60	4.47	4.38	4.42	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 11	Non-major 7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 424 1
 Title Contemp Art,Theory, Cr
 Instructor: Smalls,James
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 122
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	131/1459	4.83	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1406	4.83	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	96/1384	4.83	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	458/1489	4.50	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1438	4.80	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	794/1421	4.80	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	549/1258	4.60	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.26	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: ART 428 1
 Title Theory/Prac Art Museum
 Instructor: Jacob, Preminda
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 123
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	1	10	4.27	849/1509	4.27	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	502/1406	4.33	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	773/1384	4.07	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	749/1489	4.27	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1411	4.90	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	381/1405	4.73	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	67/1236	4.91	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	337/1260	4.63	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	229/1255	4.88	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/873	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.26	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/89	5.00	4.88	4.49	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/92	5.00	4.94	4.54	4.83	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/90	5.00	4.85	4.50	4.69	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	25/92	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.64	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	19/93	4.75	4.35	4.06	4.32	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		
				Other	1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 429 1
 Title Seminar:Art Hist & The
 Instructor: Smalls,James
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 124
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	3.81	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	349/1384	4.50	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	986/1489	4.00	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	4.75	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.26	4.33

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 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 4	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 430 1
 Title: Typography III
 Instructor: Re, Margaret A
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 125
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	5	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	303/1509	3.73	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	543/1509	3.25	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	280/1459	3.77	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	4	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	587/1406	4.25	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	199/1384	4.02	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	1	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	833/1489	3.22	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.46	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	774/1463	3.28	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	930/1438	3.20	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1084/1421	4.22	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	496/1411	3.40	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	540/1405	3.20	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	2	1	0	1	4	3.50	984/1236	3.50	4.42	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	469/1260	3.52	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	540/1255	3.78	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	770/1258	4.17	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.11	4.03	4.26	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 430 2
 Title Typography III
 Instructor: Coates, Joseph M
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 126
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	1	5	2	0	2.70	1491/1509	3.73	4.34	4.31	4.39	2.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	6	2	0	0	2.00	1505/1509	3.25	4.23	4.26	4.26	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1444/1459	3.77	4.32	4.22	4.32	2.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/1406	4.25	3.81	4.09	4.11	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1264/1384	4.02	3.67	4.11	4.23	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	2	4	0	2	0	2.25	1476/1489	3.22	3.97	4.17	4.18	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	1383/1506	4.46	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	6	0	0	2.44	1446/1463	3.28	4.12	4.09	4.18	2.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1432/1438	3.20	4.38	4.46	4.50	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1373/1421	4.22	4.77	4.73	4.76	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	1402/1411	3.40	4.31	4.31	4.35	2.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	1	0	0	1.80	1400/1405	3.20	4.31	4.32	4.34	1.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1236	3.50	4.42	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1238/1260	3.52	4.18	4.14	4.25	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1202/1255	3.78	4.41	4.33	4.46	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	932/1258	4.17	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	General	Under-grad 12	Non-major 3
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1			
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0			
				P 0	Other		
				I 0			
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 431 1
 Title Graphic Design III: Hu
 Instructor: Kozak, Jennifer (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 127
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	470/1509	4.62	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	412/1509	4.62	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	332/1406	4.50	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	677/1384	4.20	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	674/1489	4.33	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	702/1506	4.85	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	800/1438	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1060/1421	4.81	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	469/1411	4.71	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	513/1405	4.81	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	598/1236	4.46	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	93/ 873	4.80	4.11	4.03	4.26	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 431 1
 Title Graphic Design III: Hu
 Instructor: Bergin, Josephin (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 128
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	470/1509	4.62	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	412/1509	4.62	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	367/1459	4.58	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	332/1406	4.50	3.81	4.09	4.11	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	677/1384	4.20	3.67	4.11	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	674/1489	4.33	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	702/1506	4.85	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	4.75	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	4.81	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.71	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	4.81	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	100/1236	4.46	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	93/ 873	4.80	4.11	4.03	4.26	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1182/1459	3.78	4.32	4.22	4.32	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1246/1406	3.38	3.81	4.09	4.11	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1192/1384	3.50	3.67	4.11	4.23	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	917/1489	4.10	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	383/1260	4.56	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	629/1255	4.44	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	507/1258	4.67	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.26	4.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 7
84-150	1	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 484 1
 Title Advncd 3D Cmputr Anima
 Instructor: McDonald,David
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 130
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	5	0	6	3.77	1301/1509	3.77	4.34	4.31	4.39	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	3	3	1	4	3.15	1449/1509	3.15	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	4.32	4.22	4.32	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1406	****	3.81	4.09	4.11	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1258/1489	3.62	3.97	4.17	4.18	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	1412/1463	2.89	4.12	4.09	4.18	2.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	3	4	0	3	2.77	1421/1438	2.77	4.38	4.46	4.50	2.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	1	2	7	3.92	1363/1421	3.92	4.77	4.73	4.76	3.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	5	0	3	2.85	1383/1411	2.85	4.31	4.31	4.35	2.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	3	2	1	4	3.17	1334/1405	3.17	4.31	4.32	4.34	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	1038/1236	3.38	4.42	4.00	4.03	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	982/1260	3.67	4.18	4.14	4.25	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1084/1255	3.67	4.41	4.33	4.46	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1102/1258	3.67	4.47	4.38	4.51	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	585/ 873	3.80	4.11	4.03	4.26	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 12	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3				
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General	0	Under-grad 15	Non-major 3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 1				

Course-Section: ART 486 1
 Title Adv Interactive Media
 Instructor: McDonald,David
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 131
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	4	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1228/1509	3.89	4.34	4.31	4.39	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1351/1509	3.56	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	857/1287	4.14	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1314/1459	3.50	4.32	4.22	4.32	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	3.81	4.09	4.11	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1384	****	3.67	4.11	4.23	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1359/1489	3.33	3.97	4.17	4.18	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.89	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	1375/1463	3.13	4.12	4.09	4.18	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1400/1438	3.13	4.38	4.46	4.50	3.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1195/1421	4.44	4.77	4.73	4.76	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1337/1411	3.22	4.31	4.31	4.35	3.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1185/1405	3.78	4.31	4.32	4.34	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	877/1236	3.71	4.42	4.00	4.03	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1260	****	4.18	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1255	****	4.41	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1258	****	4.47	4.38	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	6
84-150	2	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 488 1
 Title Adv Topics:Aim
 Instructor: Bailey,Dan
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 132
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1509	4.92	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	412/1509	4.62	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	421/1459	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1406	****	3.81	4.09	4.11	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	513/1489	4.46	3.97	4.17	4.18	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	917/1506	4.69	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	73/1463	4.92	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	545/1438	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	376/1411	4.69	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.42	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.41	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors		12	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives		1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Course-Section: ART 489 1
 Title Senior Projects
 Instructor: Sturgeon,John
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 133
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1461/1509	3.17	4.34	4.31	4.39	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1419/1509	3.33	4.23	4.26	4.26	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1143/1459	3.83	4.32	4.22	4.32	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1398/1406	2.25	3.81	4.09	4.11	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1286/1384	3.25	3.67	4.11	4.23	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1176/1489	3.80	3.97	4.17	4.18	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1220/1405	3.67	4.31	4.32	4.34	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	681/1260	4.17	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		6	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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		0				
				?	0							

Course-Section: ART 492 1
 Title Topics:Art Or Media II
 Instructor: Rosenberg,Jason
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 134
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	673/1509	4.44	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	774/1509	4.33	4.23	4.26	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1009/1406	3.80	3.81	4.09	4.11	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1296/1384	3.20	3.67	4.11	4.23	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1430/1489	2.83	3.97	4.17	4.18	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1030/1506	4.56	4.60	4.67	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	598/1463	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.18	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.38	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	768/1411	4.38	4.31	4.31	4.35	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	383/1236	4.38	4.42	4.00	4.03	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	666/1260	4.20	4.18	4.14	4.25	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	4.40	4.41	4.33	4.46	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.88	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.94	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.85	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.46	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.35	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.25	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.75	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.33	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: ART 492 1
 Title Topics: Art Or Media II
 Instructor: Rosenberg, Jason
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 134
 MAR 22, 2010
 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	2	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 610 1
 Title Imag. Digital Seminar
 Instructor: Bradley, Stephen
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 135
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.34	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.32	4.22	4.16	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	332/1406	4.50	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	986/1489	4.00	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.60	4.67	4.71	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.12	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1116/1438	4.20	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	496/1411	4.60	4.31	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	211/1236	4.60	4.42	4.00	3.98	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.18	4.14	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.41	4.33	4.43	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.50	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.01	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	43/ 89	4.75	4.88	4.49	4.39	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	39/ 92	4.75	4.94	4.54	4.52	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.85	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	79/ 92	3.75	4.46	4.38	4.30	3.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	67/ 93	3.75	4.35	4.06	4.04	3.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	4	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	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 620 1
 Title Hist I&D Arts
 Instructor: Mahoney,James W
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 136
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	4.75	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.32	4.22	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1406	5.00	3.81	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1384	4.75	3.67	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.97	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.12	4.09	4.15	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.77	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/1236	4.75	4.42	4.00	3.98	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.18	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.41	4.33	4.43	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.47	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.11	4.03	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	43/ 89	4.75	4.88	4.49	4.39	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.94	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.85	4.50	4.48	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	25/ 92	4.75	4.46	4.38	4.30	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	33/ 93	4.50	4.35	4.06	4.04	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 3	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 3	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 2	Non-major 5
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 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 640 1
 Title Imaging & Digital Stud
 Instructor: Cazabon, Lynn
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 137
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.34	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	807/1509	4.30	4.23	4.26	4.25	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1287	****	4.39	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.32	4.22	4.16	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	623/1406	4.22	3.81	4.09	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	260/1384	4.63	3.67	4.11	4.16	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	823/1489	4.20	3.97	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.12	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.77	4.73	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.31	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	242/1236	4.56	4.42	4.00	3.98	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.18	4.14	4.21	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.41	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.47	4.38	4.50	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	550/ 873	3.88	4.11	4.03	4.01	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.88	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.94	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	35/ 90	4.71	4.85	4.50	4.48	4.71
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	44/ 92	4.57	4.46	4.38	4.30	4.57
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	40/ 93	4.40	4.35	4.06	4.04	4.40
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.75	4.39	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.67	4.18	4.03	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	3.67	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.00	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****

Frequency Distribution

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