

Course-Section: ART 210 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 59
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	2	4.14	1010/1504	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	3	3.86	1159/1503	4.38	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1453	4.55	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1379/1421	3.80	3.91	4.00	3.90	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	3	0	0	2.17	1357/1365	3.03	3.82	4.08	4.00	2.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1306/1485	4.04	4.00	4.16	4.15	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1221/1504	4.46	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1276/1483	4.22	4.27	4.06	4.02	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	1105/1425	4.54	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1256/1426	4.74	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1250/1418	4.29	4.37	4.25	4.22	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1122/1416	4.45	4.40	4.26	4.24	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	780/1199	4.57	4.54	3.97	3.95	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1070/1312	4.37	4.26	4.00	3.98	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	910/1303	4.50	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	855/1299	4.50	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	387/ 758	4.50	4.15	4.01	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 210 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 60
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	406/1504	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	209/1503	4.38	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	186/1453	4.55	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	863/1421	3.80	3.91	4.00	3.90	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	903/1365	3.03	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	738/1485	4.04	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	891/1504	4.46	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	543/1483	4.22	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	525/1425	4.54	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	4.74	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	450/1418	4.29	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	407/1416	4.45	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	213/1199	4.57	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	196/1312	4.37	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	356/1303	4.50	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1299	4.50	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 758	4.50	4.15	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 61
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	198/1504	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	248/1503	4.38	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	215/1453	4.55	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	374/1421	3.80	3.91	4.00	3.90	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1365	3.03	3.82	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	523/1485	4.04	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1200/1504	4.46	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	91/1483	4.22	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	384/1425	4.54	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.74	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	378/1418	4.29	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	296/1416	4.45	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1199	4.57	4.54	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	330/1312	4.37	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	450/1303	4.50	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	333/1299	4.50	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	4.50	4.15	4.01	3.89	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 61
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 210 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 62
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	4.62	406/1504	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	946/1503	4.38	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	407/1453	4.55	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	596/1421	3.80	3.91	4.00	3.90	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1365	3.03	3.82	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	990/1485	4.04	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1186/1504	4.46	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	613/1483	4.22	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	748/1425	4.54	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	808/1426	4.74	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	727/1418	4.29	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	675/1416	4.45	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	93/1199	4.57	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.37	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	523/1303	4.50	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	656/1299	4.50	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	4.50	4.15	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 63
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	13	4.93	105/1504	4.76	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	258/1503	4.52	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	574/1290	4.62	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	240/1453	4.63	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	392/1421	4.12	3.91	4.00	3.90	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	2	0	1	6	4.22	614/1365	4.09	3.82	4.08	4.00	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	455/1485	4.23	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	743/1504	4.89	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	119/1483	4.46	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	143/1425	4.58	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	247/1418	4.52	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	282/1416	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	177/1199	4.65	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	364/1312	4.56	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	356/1303	4.57	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	182/1299	4.87	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	114/ 758	4.13	4.15	4.01	3.89	4.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	3.33	3.92	4.23	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 63
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 211 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 64
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.76	4.45	4.27	4.26	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	74/1503	4.52	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	180/1290	4.62	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	71/1453	4.63	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	383/1421	4.12	3.91	4.00	3.90	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	8	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1365	4.09	3.82	4.08	4.00	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	124/1485	4.23	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	708/1504	4.89	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	338/1483	4.46	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	331/1425	4.58	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	191/1418	4.52	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	255/1416	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	139/1199	4.65	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	241/1312	4.56	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	227/1303	4.57	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	142/1299	4.87	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	2	8	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	185/ 758	4.13	4.15	4.01	3.89	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: WINICOV, MARK
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 65
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	406/1504	4.76	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	279/1503	4.52	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	400/1290	4.62	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	407/1453	4.63	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	997/1421	4.12	3.91	4.00	3.90	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	1	6	3.69	1046/1365	4.09	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	953/1485	4.23	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	760/1504	4.89	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	445/1483	4.46	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	525/1425	4.58	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	438/1418	4.52	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	407/1416	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	124/1199	4.65	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	465/1312	4.56	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	887/1303	4.57	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	203/1299	4.87	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	508/ 758	4.13	4.15	4.01	3.89	3.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 211 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: WINICOV, MARK
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 66
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	4.50	549/1504	4.76	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1207/1503	4.52	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	431/1290	4.62	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	680/1453	4.63	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	851/1421	4.12	3.91	4.00	3.90	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1177/1365	4.09	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	0	2	4	3.50	1284/1485	4.23	4.00	4.16	4.15	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	4.89	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	772/1483	4.46	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1217/1425	4.58	4.45	4.41	4.40	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	967/1426	4.90	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1098/1418	4.52	4.37	4.25	4.22	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	871/1416	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	349/1199	4.65	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	276/1312	4.56	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	540/1303	4.57	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	385/1299	4.87	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	563/ 758	4.13	4.15	4.01	3.89	3.57
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	198/ 225	3.33	3.92	4.23	4.52	3.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

10 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 ****/ 36 **** **** 4.60 4.13 ****

Course-Section: ART 211 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: WINICOV, MARK
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 66
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	1	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 212 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 67
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	4.30	826/1504	4.12	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	795/1503	3.92	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1193/1290	4.00	4.45	4.28	4.27	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	440/1453	4.24	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	1	2	2	3.38	1189/1421	3.16	3.91	4.00	3.90	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1225/1365	2.67	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	938/1485	3.66	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	830/1504	4.66	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	782/1483	4.01	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1105/1425	4.23	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.74	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	736/1418	4.20	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	394/1199	4.16	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	283/1312	4.28	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	563/1303	4.56	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	705/1299	4.43	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	535/ 758	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.89	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: REINSEL, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 68
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	3	3.78	1257/1504	4.12	4.45	4.27	4.26	3.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	4	2	3.56	1288/1503	3.92	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1290	4.00	4.45	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1181/1453	4.24	4.41	4.21	4.20	3.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	1	2	3.00	1305/1421	3.16	3.91	4.00	3.90	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1365	2.67	3.82	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	3	3	0	3.14	1370/1485	3.66	4.00	4.16	4.15	3.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	4.66	4.66	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	5	0	3.57	1207/1483	4.01	4.27	4.06	4.02	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1057/1425	4.23	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1089/1426	4.74	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1154/1418	4.20	4.37	4.25	4.22	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	1232/1416	4.00	4.40	4.26	4.24	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	762/1199	4.16	4.54	3.97	3.95	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	716/1312	4.28	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	563/1303	4.56	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	798/1299	4.43	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: BELL, GEOFFREY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 69
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	4.27	864/1504	4.12	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1136/1503	3.92	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.00	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	517/1453	4.24	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	2	1	3.09	1291/1421	3.16	3.91	4.00	3.90	3.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	3	3	1	1	0	2.00	1359/1365	2.67	3.82	4.08	4.00	2.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	2	3	3.73	1194/1485	3.66	4.00	4.16	4.15	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1322/1504	4.66	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	543/1483	4.01	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	971/1425	4.23	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	790/1426	4.74	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	656/1418	4.20	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	701/1416	4.00	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	519/1199	4.16	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	612/1312	4.28	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	450/1303	4.56	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	445/1299	4.43	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	364/ 758	3.90	4.15	4.01	3.89	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			

56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 213 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 70
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1061/1504	4.13	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1202/1503	3.92	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	937/1290	4.30	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	952/1453	4.26	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	0	3	1	3.14	1276/1421	3.68	3.91	4.00	3.90	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	3	2	1	2.31	1355/1365	3.09	3.82	4.08	4.00	2.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1170/1485	3.67	4.00	4.16	4.15	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1392/1504	4.32	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1250/1483	3.86	4.27	4.06	4.02	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1294/1425	3.90	4.45	4.41	4.40	3.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1426	4.77	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1250/1418	3.90	4.37	4.25	4.22	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	1222/1416	3.82	4.40	4.26	4.24	3.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	403/1199	4.50	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	530/1312	4.03	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	333/1303	4.54	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	537/1299	4.62	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 758	4.13	4.15	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: Eby, Chad
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 71
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	624/1504	4.13	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	919/1503	3.92	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	4.30	4.45	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	752/1453	4.26	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	571/1421	3.68	3.91	4.00	3.90	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	1	2	3	3.20	1262/1365	3.09	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	3	5	3.82	1140/1485	3.67	4.00	4.16	4.15	3.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	812/1504	4.32	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	700/1483	3.86	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1076/1425	3.90	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	502/1426	4.77	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	578/1418	3.90	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	994/1416	3.82	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	213/1199	4.50	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	716/1312	4.03	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.54	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	4.62	4.51	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.13	4.15	4.01	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 72
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1214/1504	4.13	4.45	4.27	4.26	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	4	6	3.80	1183/1503	3.92	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	412/1290	4.30	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	578/1453	4.26	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	3.68	3.91	4.00	3.90	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1003/1365	3.09	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	3	6	2	3.43	1306/1485	3.67	4.00	4.16	4.15	3.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1392/1504	4.32	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	989/1483	3.86	4.27	4.06	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1211/1425	3.90	4.45	4.41	4.40	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	1073/1426	4.77	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	3	1	7	3.71	1181/1418	3.90	4.37	4.25	4.22	3.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	0	6	4	3.77	1162/1416	3.82	4.40	4.26	4.24	3.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	253/1199	4.50	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	2	6	3.77	897/1312	4.03	4.26	4.00	3.98	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	0	1	3	7	4.00	910/1303	4.54	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	768/1299	4.62	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.31
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	304/ 758	4.13	4.15	4.01	3.89	4.25
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 213 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 72
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 214 0101
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 73
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	4.22	927/1504	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	437/1503	4.52	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.83	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	680/1453	4.30	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	479/1421	4.33	3.91	4.00	3.90	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1265/1485	3.48	4.00	4.16	4.15	3.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1274/1504	4.27	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	4.51	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.44	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	967/1426	4.66	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	578/1418	4.25	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.39	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	177/1199	4.56	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.40	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	737/1303	3.86	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	741/1299	4.38	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 758	4.00	4.15	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 214 0201
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: PENNY, JOHN E
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 74
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4	8	4.43	669/1504	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	891/1503	4.52	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1181/1453	4.30	4.41	4.21	4.20	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	0	2	5	1	0	2.88	1413/1485	3.48	4.00	4.16	4.15	2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1300/1504	4.27	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	741/1483	4.51	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1257/1425	4.44	4.45	4.41	4.40	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1169/1426	4.66	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1287/1418	4.25	4.37	4.25	4.22	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1248/1416	4.39	4.40	4.26	4.24	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	636/1199	4.56	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	858/1312	4.40	4.26	4.00	3.98	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1250/1303	3.86	4.44	4.24	4.23	2.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1038/1299	4.38	4.51	4.25	4.21	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	4.00	4.15	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 214 0301
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 75
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	206/1504	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	200/1503	4.52	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	4.83	4.45	4.28	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	179/1453	4.30	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	4.33	3.91	4.00	3.90	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	990/1485	3.48	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1221/1504	4.27	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	119/1483	4.51	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	384/1425	4.44	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.66	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	145/1418	4.25	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	175/1416	4.39	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1199	4.56	4.54	3.97	3.95	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	221/1312	4.40	4.26	4.00	3.98	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1303	3.86	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	4.38	4.51	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.15	4.01	3.89	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 123
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 76
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	24	28	4.40	700/1504	4.40	4.45	4.27	4.26	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	17	33	4.42	618/1503	4.42	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	13	41	4.65	367/1290	4.65	4.45	4.28	4.27	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	7	25	21	4.22	810/1453	4.22	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	8	13	28	4.36	449/1421	4.36	3.91	4.00	3.90	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	17	19	18	3.96	830/1365	3.96	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	7	16	29	4.27	738/1485	4.27	4.00	4.16	4.15	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	42	4.76	879/1504	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	37	11	4.11	782/1483	4.11	4.27	4.06	4.02	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	18	37	4.63	634/1425	4.63	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	8	47	4.85	620/1426	4.85	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	19	34	4.56	501/1418	4.56	4.37	4.25	4.22	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	20	34	4.60	525/1416	4.60	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	5	9	38	4.52	265/1199	4.52	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	2	7	14	8	3.73	917/1312	3.73	4.26	4.00	3.98	3.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	2	4	6	20	4.27	783/1303	4.27	4.44	4.24	4.23	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	1	7	9	16	4.21	822/1299	4.21	4.51	4.25	4.21	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	24	25	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 0	A 34	Required for Majors	25
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 8	C 1	General	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 15	D 0		Under-grad 57
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	24

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 109
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 77
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	3	16	15	14	3.72	1280/1504	3.72	4.45	4.27	4.26	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	14	14	16	4	3.12	1403/1503	3.12	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	10	17	9	9	3.14	1227/1290	3.14	4.45	4.28	4.27	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	4	10	9	15	6	3.20	1377/1453	3.20	4.41	4.21	4.20	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	3	9	16	15	3.63	1036/1421	3.63	3.91	4.00	3.90	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	4	11	5	15	10	3.36	1218/1365	3.36	3.82	4.08	4.00	3.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	4	6	14	17	8	3.39	1317/1485	3.39	4.00	4.16	4.15	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	26	22	4.46	1130/1504	4.46	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	1	8	18	9	4	3.17	1349/1483	3.18	4.27	4.06	4.02	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	10	13	20	4.07	1143/1425	4.07	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	5	40	4.71	895/1426	4.71	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	3	6	12	17	7	3.42	1275/1418	3.42	4.37	4.25	4.22	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	9	8	12	17	3.74	1171/1416	3.74	4.40	4.26	4.24	3.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	2	1	7	9	22	4.17	555/1199	4.17	4.54	3.97	3.95	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	12	3	6	4	6	2.65	1227/1312	2.65	4.26	4.00	3.98	2.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	10	7	8	1	3	2.31	1259/1303	2.31	4.44	4.24	4.23	2.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	8	4	9	6	2	2.66	1240/1299	2.66	4.51	4.25	4.21	2.66
4. Were special techniques successful	21	25	2	0	3	0	0	2.20	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	5	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	5	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	3	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	2	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	3	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	1	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	48	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	1	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.44	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	1	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	1	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	1	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	1	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 109
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 77
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	11	General	7	Under-grad	50	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 305 0101
 Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 78
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	853/1290	4.17	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	352/1453	4.58	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	935/1421	3.82	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	3	4	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	3.82	4.08	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1194/1485	3.73	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	397/1483	4.45	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.92	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	475/1418	4.58	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	142/1416	4.91	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	129/1199	4.75	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	424/1312	4.44	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	630/1303	4.44	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 315 0101
 Title VIDEO I
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 79
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	0	3	2.92	1333/1421	2.92	3.91	4.00	4.01	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	812/1504	4.82	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	782/1483	4.11	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1076/1425	4.20	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	656/1418	4.44	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	574/1416	4.56	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	329/1199	4.44	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	317/1312	4.57	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1303	4.43	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	656/1299	4.43	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 321 0101
 Title 19TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 80
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	25	4.77	239/1504	4.77	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	8	16	4.26	848/1503	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	11	17	4.45	574/1290	4.45	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	4	8	16	4.34	668/1453	4.34	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.34
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	6	7	14	4.07	705/1421	4.07	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	7	11	9	3.83	947/1365	3.83	3.82	4.08	4.08	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	8	8	11	3.90	1086/1485	3.90	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	17	13	4.43	1147/1504	4.43	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	16	12	4.29	591/1483	4.29	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.45	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	426/1418	4.62	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	142/1416	4.90	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	4	24	4.70	159/1199	4.70	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	8	6	3	3.53	1004/1312	3.53	4.26	4.00	4.09	3.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	1	7	1	8	3.78	1041/1303	3.78	4.44	4.24	4.27	3.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	855/1299	4.17	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	14	15	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 321 0101
 Title 19TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: SMALLS, JAMES
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 80
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	32	Non-major	5
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 323 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 81
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	11	4.33	788/1504	4.46	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	8	3.95	1094/1503	4.32	4.33	4.20	4.22	3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	10	4.00	937/1290	4.33	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	7	5	6	3.70	1214/1453	4.11	4.41	4.21	4.23	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	3	12	4.14	642/1421	4.16	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	2	6	8	4.06	754/1365	4.20	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	4	12	4.29	727/1485	4.42	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	14	6	4.14	1353/1504	4.54	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	9	4	3.94	933/1483	4.25	4.27	4.06	4.08	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	700/1425	4.72	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	895/1426	4.84	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	818/1418	4.54	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	554/1416	4.68	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	183/1199	4.77	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.65
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	1	3	4	3.33	1070/1312	3.67	4.26	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	2	3	2	1	4	3.17	1182/1303	3.85	4.44	4.24	4.27	3.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	2	1	5	3.42	1136/1299	4.05	4.51	4.25	4.30	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	9	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	3.93	4.15	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 21	Non-major 7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 18		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ART 323 0201
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 82
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	10	18	4.59	442/1504	4.46	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	290/1503	4.32	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	21	4.66	356/1290	4.33	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	4	5	18	4.52	429/1453	4.11	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	9	14	4.17	614/1421	4.16	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	9	15	4.34	483/1365	4.20	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	20	4.55	402/1485	4.42	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	460/1504	4.54	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	290/1483	4.25	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	239/1425	4.72	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	201/1426	4.84	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	205/1418	4.54	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	24	4.79	268/1416	4.68	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	79/1199	4.77	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	5	10	9	4.00	716/1312	3.67	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	1	4	19	4.54	546/1303	3.85	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	3	21	4.69	415/1299	4.05	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	1	0	3	6	5	3.93	445/ 758	3.93	4.15	4.01	4.00	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 323 0201
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 82
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	30	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 325 0101
 Title HIST OF FILM & VIDEO
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 83
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	2	8	10	12	3.91	1194/1504	3.91	4.45	4.27	4.27	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	2	7	8	7	10	3.47	1317/1503	3.47	4.33	4.20	4.22	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	1	1	7	8	16	4.12	880/1290	4.12	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	24	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	****/1453	****	4.41	4.21	4.23	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	4	1	1	6	7	14	4.10	679/1421	4.10	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	27	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	2	3	1	4	9	13	3.93	1057/1485	3.93	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	657/1504	4.91	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	3	0	1	8	10	6	3.84	1051/1483	3.84	4.27	4.06	4.08	3.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	7	7	19	4.36	940/1425	4.36	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	878/1426	4.73	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	3	5	9	15	4.13	964/1418	4.13	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	4	10	6	12	3.73	1180/1416	3.73	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	4	0	28	4.75	129/1199	4.75	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	6	2	2	3	4	2.82	1197/1312	2.82	4.26	4.00	4.09	2.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	7	3	2	2	3	2.47	1247/1303	2.47	4.44	4.24	4.27	2.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	2	4	6	3	1	2.81	1225/1299	2.81	4.51	4.25	4.30	2.81
4. Were special techniques successful	24	14	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.00	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	Required for Majors	Graduate	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 2			Major 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	General	Under-grad	42
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 5			Non-major 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	Electives		
			Other		
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ART 327 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 84
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	469/1504	4.56	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	15	4.52	472/1503	4.52	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	18	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	331/1453	4.61	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	276/1421	4.56	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	18	4.58	245/1365	4.58	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	3	3	7	10	3.92	1076/1485	3.92	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	760/1504	4.85	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	195/1483	4.68	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	143/1425	4.92	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	101/1418	4.92	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	164/1416	4.88	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	82/1199	4.88	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	6	14	4.52	350/1312	4.52	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	248/1303	4.86	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	26	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: Kozak, Jennifer
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 85
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	176/1504	4.81	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	209/1503	4.85	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	166/1290	4.86	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	320/1453	4.73	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	4.75	3.91	4.00	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	782/1365	4.13	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	78/1485	4.96	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1483	4.77	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	270/1425	4.88	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.92	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	247/1418	4.84	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	310/1416	4.80	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	195/1199	4.65	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	364/1312	4.61	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	450/1303	4.74	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	570/1299	4.75	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	2	0	0	10	4.50	185/ 758	4.31	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: Kozak, Jennifer
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 85
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 331 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: Kozak, Jennifer
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 86
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	10	4.77	250/1504	4.81	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	85/1503	4.85	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1290	4.86	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	135/1453	4.73	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1421	4.75	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	581/1365	4.13	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1485	4.96	4.00	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	108/1483	4.77	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	161/1425	4.88	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.92	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	113/1418	4.84	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	221/1416	4.80	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	177/1199	4.65	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	215/1312	4.61	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1303	4.74	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1299	4.75	4.51	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	369/ 758	4.31	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.11

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: WITKOWSKI, TRIS
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 87
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	396/1504	4.63	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	125/1503	4.85	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	344/1290	4.79	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	563/1453	4.66	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	5	6	3.81	935/1421	4.00	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1365	5.00	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	0	4	10	4.31	693/1485	4.29	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1087/1504	4.57	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	810/1483	4.29	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	331/1425	4.90	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	184/1418	4.81	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	324/1416	4.73	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	88/1199	4.78	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	716/1312	4.17	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	652/1303	4.55	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	904/1299	4.45	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	231/ 758	4.71	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.43
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: WITKOWSKI, TRIS
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 87
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 332 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: WITKOWSKI, TRIS
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 88
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	386/1504	4.63	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	164/1503	4.85	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	131/1290	4.79	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1453	4.66	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	605/1421	4.00	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1365	5.00	3.82	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	0	8	4.27	738/1485	4.29	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1006/1504	4.57	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	338/1483	4.29	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1425	4.90	4.45	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	191/1418	4.81	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	407/1416	4.73	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	159/1199	4.78	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	530/1312	4.17	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.55	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.45	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 758	4.71	4.15	4.01	4.00	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 332 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: WITKOWSKI, TRIS
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 88
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 333 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 89
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	4.64	376/1504	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	335/1503	4.65	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	290/1290	4.76	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	407/1453	4.58	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	2	6	4.08	698/1421	4.08	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1365	4.80	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	380/1485	4.43	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	1392/1504	4.21	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	700/1483	4.25	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1082/1425	4.31	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1096/1426	4.44	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	745/1418	4.40	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	688/1416	4.44	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	0	1	0	3	3.33	987/1199	3.81	4.54	3.97	4.02	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	196/1312	4.41	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	356/1303	4.52	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1299	4.38	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	293/ 758	4.34	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	4.25	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	4.25	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	4.75	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	4.50	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 333 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 89
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 333 0301
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 90
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	8	4.47	609/1504	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	312/1503	4.65	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	201/1290	4.76	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	320/1453	4.58	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	698/1421	4.08	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1365	4.80	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	4	8	4.29	727/1485	4.43	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1207/1504	4.21	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	580/1483	4.25	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	876/1425	4.31	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	1232/1426	4.44	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	682/1418	4.40	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	727/1416	4.44	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	471/1199	3.81	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	697/1312	4.41	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	776/1303	4.52	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	869/1299	4.38	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	243/ 758	4.34	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	116/ 233	4.25	4.25	4.09	4.12	4.25
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	132/ 244	4.25	4.25	4.09	4.20	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	64/ 227	4.75	4.75	4.40	4.46	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	103/ 225	4.50	3.92	4.23	4.29	4.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 333 0301
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 90
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 334 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: TOOTOONCHI, NAH
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 91
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	2	4	0	2	2.64	1489/1504	2.77	4.45	4.27	4.27	2.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	3	2	3.09	1408/1503	2.91	4.33	4.20	4.22	3.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	0	4	3.40	1333/1453	3.45	4.41	4.21	4.23	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1421	****	3.91	4.00	4.01	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	4	2	1	1	0	1.88	1480/1485	1.72	4.00	4.16	4.17	1.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1504	4.86	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	3	3	1	0	2.20	1461/1483	2.51	4.27	4.06	4.08	2.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	5	1	1	2.89	1388/1425	2.69	4.45	4.41	4.43	2.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1348/1426	3.87	4.81	4.69	4.71	3.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	4	0	0	2.38	1398/1418	2.44	4.37	4.25	4.26	2.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	2	1	1	2.33	1392/1416	2.60	4.40	4.26	4.27	2.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1125/1199	2.67	4.54	3.97	4.02	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	947/1312	3.26	4.26	4.00	4.09	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	910/1303	3.64	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	1092/1299	3.23	4.51	4.25	4.30	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	580/ 758	2.75	4.15	4.01	4.00	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 334 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: TOOTOONCHI, NAH
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 91
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 334 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: TOOTOONCHI, NAH
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 92
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	1470/1504	2.77	4.45	4.27	4.27	2.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	2	5	1	1	2.73	1465/1503	2.91	4.33	4.20	4.22	2.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1282/1453	3.45	4.41	4.21	4.23	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1421	****	3.91	4.00	4.01	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	2	6	2	0	1	0	1.56	1485/1485	1.72	4.00	4.16	4.17	1.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.86	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	5	3	0	2.82	1413/1483	2.51	4.27	4.06	4.08	2.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	1409/1425	2.69	4.45	4.41	4.43	2.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1353/1426	3.87	4.81	4.69	4.71	3.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1393/1418	2.44	4.37	4.25	4.26	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	1347/1416	2.60	4.40	4.26	4.27	2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1199	2.67	4.54	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	4	0	1	2.86	1193/1312	3.26	4.26	4.00	4.09	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1162/1303	3.64	4.44	4.24	4.27	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1220/1299	3.23	4.51	4.25	4.30	2.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	752/ 758	2.75	4.15	4.01	4.00	2.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 341 0101
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: Delaney, Rick
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 93
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	10	4.64	376/1504	4.65	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	414/1503	4.54	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1290	4.00	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	186/1453	4.48	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	863/1421	4.16	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1365	3.67	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	423/1485	4.35	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	1047/1504	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	710/1483	4.24	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1136/1425	3.99	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1036/1426	4.53	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	939/1418	4.13	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	769/1416	4.34	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	310/1199	4.68	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	632/1312	4.23	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	507/1303	4.43	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	303/1299	4.46	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 341 0201
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: Delaney, Rick
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 94
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	357/1504	4.65	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	495/1503	4.54	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	855/1453	4.48	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	401/1421	4.16	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	3.82	4.08	4.08	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	866/1485	4.35	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	983/1504	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	580/1483	4.24	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1223/1425	3.99	4.45	4.41	4.43	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1169/1426	4.53	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	981/1418	4.13	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	829/1416	4.34	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	82/1199	4.68	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	592/1312	4.23	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	796/1303	4.43	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	883/1299	4.46	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 758	4.00	4.15	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 341 0201
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: Delaney, Rick
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 94
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 343 0101
 Title HISTORY OF ANIMATION
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 95
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	1	5	13	20	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	7	16	16	4.23	869/1503	4.23	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	8	14	17	4.23	800/1290	4.23	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	501/1453	4.47	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	17	17	4.31	509/1421	4.31	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	30	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	11	22	4.49	482/1485	4.49	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.49
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	0	3	15	8	4.19	700/1483	4.19	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	2	5	27	4.74	456/1425	4.74	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	7	27	4.79	755/1426	4.79	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	12	21	4.59	475/1418	4.59	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	12	20	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	2	31	4.88	82/1199	4.88	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	7	8	8	3.92	804/1312	3.92	4.26	4.00	4.09	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	2	2	5	15	4.38	701/1303	4.38	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	455/1299	4.65	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	16	22	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	22						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	40	Non-major	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 345 0101
 Title FILM II:SOUND & IMAGE
 Instructor: LAVENSTEIN, HOL
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 96
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.60	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.54	3.97	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.26	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.44	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.15	4.01	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 347 0101
 Title WRITING FOR FILM
 Instructor: LAVENSTEIN, HOL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 97
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	10	4.77	250/1504	4.77	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	678/1503	4.38	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1049/1421	3.62	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	69/1365	4.92	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	4	0	6	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1069/1504	4.54	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	888/1425	4.42	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1418	4.73	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	748/1199	3.90	4.54	3.97	4.02	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	3	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	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 351 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO
 Instructor: WINICOV, MARK
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 98
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	851/1504	4.29	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1192/1503	3.79	4.33	4.20	4.22	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1209/1453	3.71	4.41	4.21	4.23	3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	5	0	1	2.21	1406/1421	2.21	3.91	4.00	4.01	2.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	5	1	1	2.69	1334/1365	2.69	3.82	4.08	4.08	2.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	4	2	3	0	1	2.20	1474/1485	2.20	4.00	4.16	4.17	2.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	6	5	2	3.69	1157/1483	3.69	4.27	4.06	4.08	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	525/1425	4.69	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1104/1426	4.54	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1081/1418	3.92	4.37	4.25	4.26	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1238/1416	3.54	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.54
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	455/1199	4.31	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	5	2	3.67	947/1312	3.67	4.26	4.00	4.09	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	518/1303	4.58	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 351 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO
 Instructor: WINICOV, MARK
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 98
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 352 0101
 Title SEQUENCE AND TIME
 Instructor: CAZABON, LYNN
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 99
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	4.53	509/1504	4.53	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	837/1503	4.27	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	698/1421	4.07	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	804/1483	4.08	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	748/1425	4.54	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	727/1418	4.38	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	829/1416	4.31	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	159/1199	4.69	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	454/1312	4.42	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.44	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 353 0101
 Title COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 100
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	376/1504	4.64	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	718/1453	4.31	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	698/1421	4.08	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1275/1365	3.14	3.82	4.08	4.08	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	878/1485	4.15	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1002/1425	4.31	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	247/1418	4.77	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	675/1416	4.46	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	102/1199	4.82	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	689/1312	4.10	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	197/1303	4.90	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	203/1299	4.90	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 370 0101
 Title SILKSCREEN PRINTING
 Instructor: ACHJADI, DIYAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 101
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	106/1503	4.90	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	991/1421	3.70	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	1153/1365	3.50	3.82	4.08	4.08	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	591/1485	4.40	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	179/1425	4.90	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.37	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	422/1303	4.70	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	415/1299	4.70	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	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 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 10	Non-major 1
84-150	3	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 4		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 382 0101
 Title INTERACTIVITY
 Instructor: Echeverry, Sant
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 102
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	168/1504	4.86	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	335/1503	4.64	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	501/1453	4.46	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	903/1421	3.86	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	878/1365	3.92	3.82	4.08	4.08	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	727/1485	4.29	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1022/1504	4.62	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	488/1418	4.57	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	282/1416	4.79	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	61/1199	4.93	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	203/1299	4.90	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****

Course-Section: ART 382 0101
 Title INTERACTIVITY
 Instructor: Echeverry, Sant
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 102
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 384 0101
 Title COMPUTER ANIMATION
 Instructor: McIntyre, Frank
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 103
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	386/1504	4.64	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	903/1421	3.86	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	731/1483	4.17	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	900/1425	4.40	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1225/1418	3.60	4.37	4.25	4.26	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1099/1416	3.90	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	519/1199	4.22	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	663/1312	4.14	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	869/1299	4.14	4.51	4.25	4.30	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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 385 0101
 Title DIGITAL MONTAGE
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 104
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	228/1504	4.79	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	258/1503	4.71	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.45	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	290/1453	4.64	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	5	3	3.64	1030/1421	3.64	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1113/1365	3.58	3.82	4.08	4.08	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	806/1485	4.21	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	108/1483	4.83	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	402/1425	4.77	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	401/1426	4.92	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	247/1418	4.77	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	310/1416	4.77	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	124/1199	4.77	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	290/1312	4.62	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	258/1303	4.85	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1299	4.85	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 388 0101
 Title ART ON THE INTERNET
 Instructor: Echeverry, Sant
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 105
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	639/1504	4.44	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	385/1453	4.56	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	1	0	2	2.83	1353/1421	2.83	3.91	4.00	4.01	2.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	2	0	0	2	2.67	1337/1365	2.67	3.82	4.08	4.08	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	298/1483	4.56	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	848/1418	4.25	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	201/1199	4.63	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: ART 388 0101
 Title ART ON THE INTERNET
 Instructor: Echeverry, Sant
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 105
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 389 0101
 Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 106
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	2	3	4	3.82	1239/1504	3.82	4.45	4.27	4.27	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	2	0	4	3.09	1408/1503	3.09	4.33	4.20	4.22	3.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1379/1421	2.67	3.91	4.00	4.01	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	3.82	4.08	4.08	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	6	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1348/1485	3.25	4.00	4.16	4.17	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	2	0	3.25	1327/1483	3.25	4.27	4.06	4.08	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1076/1425	4.20	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1225/1418	3.60	4.37	4.25	4.26	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	5	0	3.20	1304/1416	3.20	4.40	4.26	4.27	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	195/1199	4.64	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	572/1312	4.29	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	488/1303	4.63	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1299	4.63	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.00
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 392 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA
 Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 107
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	10	4.82	198/1504	4.82	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.33	4.20	4.22	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	396/1453	4.55	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	863/1421	3.91	3.91	4.00	4.01	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	370/1365	4.44	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	144/1485	4.82	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	1200/1504	4.36	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	119/1483	4.80	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.45	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	126/1418	4.91	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	485/1416	4.64	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	77/1199	4.91	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	826/1312	3.89	4.26	4.00	4.09	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1299	4.89	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	4	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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 395 0101
 Title TELEVISION PRODUCTION
 Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 108
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	131/1504	4.90	4.45	4.27	4.27	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	106/1503	4.90	4.33	4.20	4.22	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	832/1290	4.20	4.45	4.28	4.31	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	669/1421	4.11	3.91	4.00	4.01	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	3.82	4.08	4.08	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1485	4.78	4.00	4.16	4.17	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1058/1504	4.56	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.27	4.06	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	384/1425	4.78	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.81	4.69	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	233/1418	4.78	4.37	4.25	4.26	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.27	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	119/1199	4.78	4.54	3.97	4.02	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	283/1312	4.63	4.26	4.00	4.09	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	488/1303	4.63	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.51	4.25	4.30	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	163/ 758	4.57	4.15	4.01	4.00	4.57
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 424 0101
 Title CONTEMP ART,THEORY, CR
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 109
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	1010/1504	4.14	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	954/1503	4.14	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	718/1453	4.31	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	182/1421	4.71	3.91	4.00	4.02	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	4	3.93	878/1365	3.93	3.82	4.08	4.09	3.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	648/1485	4.36	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	187/1483	4.69	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	748/1425	4.54	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	539/1418	4.54	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	829/1416	4.31	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	61/1199	4.92	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	269/1312	4.64	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	321/1303	4.79	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.15	4.01	4.17	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 428 0101
 Title THEORY/PRAC ART MUSEUM
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 110
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	962/1504	4.20	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	194/1421	4.70	3.91	4.00	4.02	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	525/1365	4.30	3.82	4.08	4.09	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	830/1485	4.20	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	139/1418	4.89	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1416	4.89	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	329/1199	4.44	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	197/1303	4.90	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	364/ 758	4.13	4.15	4.01	4.17	4.13

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 430 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI
 Instructor: RE, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 111
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	262/1504	4.46	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	556/1503	4.27	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.45	4.28	4.32	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	320/1453	4.40	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1421	3.50	3.91	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	274/1365	3.81	3.82	4.08	4.09	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	2	6	3.69	1210/1485	3.85	4.00	4.16	4.14	3.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1121/1504	4.50	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	409/1483	4.47	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1094/1425	4.25	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1426	4.85	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	848/1418	4.19	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	1001/1416	4.17	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	495/1199	4.13	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	255/1312	4.33	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	450/1303	4.52	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	354/1299	4.63	4.51	4.25	4.38	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	185/ 758	4.58	4.15	4.01	4.17	4.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 430 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 112
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	991/1504	4.46	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1002/1503	4.27	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	4.43	4.45	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	855/1453	4.40	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	3.91	4.00	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	1	3	3.09	1286/1365	3.81	3.82	4.08	4.09	3.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	990/1485	3.85	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1064/1504	4.50	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	338/1483	4.47	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	971/1425	4.25	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.85	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	964/1418	4.19	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	871/1416	4.17	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	636/1199	4.13	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	1	5	4.00	716/1312	4.33	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	701/1303	4.52	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	570/1299	4.63	4.51	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.58	4.15	4.01	4.17	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 431 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: IVY, JEANNE C.
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 113
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	206/1504	4.61	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	106/1503	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.42	4.45	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1453	4.55	4.41	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	479/1421	3.95	3.91	4.00	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	297/1365	4.25	3.82	4.08	4.09	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	98/1485	4.13	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.74	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1483	4.78	4.27	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1425	4.35	4.45	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	4.60	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1418	4.45	4.37	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	142/1416	4.51	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	519/1199	4.22	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	183/1312	4.44	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.29	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1299	4.60	4.51	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	535/ 758	3.50	4.15	4.01	4.17	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 431 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 114
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	684/1504	4.61	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	3	4	4	3.62	1267/1503	4.26	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	853/1290	4.42	4.45	4.28	4.32	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	947/1453	4.55	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1073/1421	3.95	3.91	4.00	4.02	3.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	782/1365	4.25	3.82	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	3	0	1	5	3.36	1322/1485	4.13	4.00	4.16	4.14	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	1041/1504	4.74	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	298/1483	4.78	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1270/1425	4.35	4.45	4.41	4.38	3.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	1290/1426	4.60	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1098/1418	4.45	4.37	4.25	4.25	3.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	985/1416	4.51	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	519/1199	4.22	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	689/1312	4.44	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1063/1303	4.29	4.44	4.24	4.34	3.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	834/1299	4.60	4.51	4.25	4.38	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	630/ 758	3.50	4.15	4.01	4.17	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.25	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	4.25	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.75	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	3.92	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.83	****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	****	****

Course-Section: ART 431 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 114
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 447 0101
 Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI
 Instructor: McIntyre, Frank
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 115
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	725/1504	4.38	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	718/1453	4.30	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	3.91	4.00	4.02	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	705/1485	4.30	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	810/1483	4.08	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.08

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	842/1425	4.45	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	643/1418	4.45	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	366/1416	4.73	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	195/1199	4.64	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.64

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	663/1312	4.14	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	523/1303	4.57	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	523/1299	4.57	4.51	4.25	4.38	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.17	****

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 457 0101
 Title PHOTO SENIOR THESIS II
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 116
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	495/1504	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	707/1503	4.36	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	685/1421	4.09	3.91	4.00	4.02	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	3.82	4.08	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	2	1	4	1	3.22	1354/1485	3.22	4.00	4.16	4.14	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	242/1483	4.63	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	384/1425	4.78	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	498/1416	4.63	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	85/1199	4.88	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	493/1312	4.38	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1299	4.63	4.51	4.25	4.38	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	304/ 758	4.25	4.15	4.01	4.17	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	11	Non-major	0
84-150	8	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	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 460 0101
 Title INSTALLATION ART
 Instructor: ACHJADI, DIYAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 117
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	8	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	152/1453	4.82	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	320/1421	4.50	3.91	4.00	4.02	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	737/1365	4.08	3.82	4.08	4.09	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	613/1483	4.27	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1418	4.73	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	96/1199	4.83	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	215/1312	4.73	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1303	4.82	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	293/1299	4.82	4.51	4.25	4.38	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.15	4.01	4.17	4.50

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 484 0201
 Title ADVANCED 3D ANIMATION
 Instructor: PRICE, ALAN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 118
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	131/1504	4.90	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	131/1290	4.90	4.45	4.28	4.32	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	179/1453	4.78	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.91	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1365	****	3.82	4.08	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	591/1485	4.40	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	1173/1504	4.40	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1483	4.88	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.45	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	139/1418	4.89	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	119/1199	4.78	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.44	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 486 0101
 Title ADVANCED INTERACTIVITY
 Instructor: Echeverry, Sant
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 119
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	386/1504	4.64	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	707/1503	4.36	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	215/1453	4.73	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	6	2	3.70	991/1421	3.70	3.91	4.00	4.02	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	614/1365	4.22	3.82	4.08	4.09	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	636/1485	4.36	4.00	4.16	4.14	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	1261/1504	4.27	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	525/1425	4.70	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	342/1418	4.70	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	142/1416	4.90	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	77/1199	4.90	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.51	4.25	4.38	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 489A 0101
 Title SENIOR PROJECTS
 Instructor: PRICE, ALAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 120
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	851/1504	4.29	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	816/1503	4.29	4.33	4.20	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	563/1453	4.43	4.41	4.21	4.22	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1421	****	3.91	4.00	4.02	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	2	0	6	3.58	1113/1365	3.58	3.82	4.08	4.09	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	1312/1485	3.40	4.00	4.16	4.14	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1186/1504	4.38	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	580/1483	4.30	4.27	4.06	4.11	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	700/1425	4.57	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	488/1418	4.57	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.40	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	61/1199	4.93	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	310/1312	4.58	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.44	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.15	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0124
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 121
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1029/1504	4.13	4.45	4.27	4.33	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1263/1503	3.63	4.33	4.20	4.18	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.45	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1253/1453	3.60	4.41	4.21	4.22	3.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	479/1421	4.33	3.91	4.00	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	3.82	4.08	4.09	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1146/1485	3.80	4.00	4.16	4.14	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1504	4.86	4.66	4.69	4.73	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.27	4.06	4.11	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1229/1425	3.88	4.45	4.41	4.38	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.81	4.69	4.72	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.37	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1112/1416	3.88	4.40	4.26	4.26	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	369/1199	4.40	4.54	3.97	4.05	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.26	4.00	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.44	4.24	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.51	4.25	4.38	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	4.15	4.01	4.17	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 640 0101
 Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 122
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.45	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.33	4.20	4.28	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.41	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	410/1421	4.40	3.91	4.00	4.27	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	187/1365	4.67	3.82	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.00	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1173/1504	4.40	4.66	4.69	4.79	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.27	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.45	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.81	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.37	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.54	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.26	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.44	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.51	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.15	4.01	4.24	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	****	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 73	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.15	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

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

I 0
? 0

Other

5