

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: DANNA, S  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 556  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	8	11	4.27	870/1639	4.33	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	425/1639	4.37	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	517/1397	4.43	4.58	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	455/1583	4.49	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	15	4.45	388/1532	4.27	4.00	4.01	4.05	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	329/1504	4.43	4.37	4.05	4.12	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	249/1612	4.64	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	0	9	11	4.32	1303/1635	4.40	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	748/1579	4.17	4.24	4.08	4.07	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	1162/1518	4.28	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	1033/1520	4.80	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	674/1517	4.56	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	920/1550	4.45	4.34	4.22	4.20	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	768/1295	3.75	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	403/1398	4.49	4.48	4.07	4.13	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.76	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	317/1388	4.83	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	349/ 958	4.41	4.27	3.93	3.97	4.25	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	3.67	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other 19
				? 1	

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: GAURIN, ADELL A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 557  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.67	430/1639	4.33	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	840/1639	4.37	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1397	4.43	4.58	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	177/1583	4.49	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	4	8	4.00	774/1532	4.27	4.00	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	506/1504	4.43	4.37	4.05	4.12	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	376/1612	4.64	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	6	4.33	1288/1635	4.40	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	484/1579	4.17	4.24	4.08	4.07	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	1000/1518	4.28	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1520	4.80	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	428/1517	4.56	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	614/1550	4.45	4.34	4.22	4.20	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	600/1295	3.75	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.06	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	11	4.54	408/1398	4.49	4.48	4.07	4.13	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	380/1391	4.76	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	179/1388	4.83	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	115/ 958	4.41	4.27	3.93	3.97	4.77	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.44	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.59	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	3.67	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: GAURIN, ADELL A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 557  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0301  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: DANNA, S  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 558  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	5	8	4.06	1103/1639	4.33	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	877/1639	4.37	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	7	4	4	4.36	696/1397	4.43	4.58	4.28	4.26	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	910/1583	4.49	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	488/1532	4.27	4.00	4.01	4.05	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	529/1504	4.43	4.37	4.05	4.12	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	408/1612	4.64	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1094/1635	4.40	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1022/1579	4.17	4.24	4.08	4.07	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	1042/1518	4.28	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	925/1520	4.80	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	474/1517	4.56	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	522/1550	4.45	4.34	4.22	4.20	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	2	0	5	2	3	3.33	1067/1295	3.75	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	532/1398	4.49	4.48	4.07	4.13	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	525/1391	4.76	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	387/1388	4.83	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	380/ 958	4.41	4.27	3.93	3.97	4.20	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	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 17	Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 559  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	7	9	4.15	1003/1639	4.29	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	3	14	4.40	684/1639	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	182/1397	4.88	4.58	4.28	4.26	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	347/1583	4.67	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	4	9	3.90	911/1532	4.30	4.00	4.01	4.05	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	253/1504	4.61	4.37	4.05	4.12	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	2	13	4.30	756/1612	4.33	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	1135/1635	4.57	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	725/1579	4.24	4.24	4.08	4.07	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	397/1518	4.86	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	571/1520	4.95	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	206/1517	4.92	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	4	13	4.42	742/1550	4.67	4.34	4.22	4.20	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	234/1295	4.62	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1030/1398	4.20	4.48	4.07	4.13	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	752/1391	4.62	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.89	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 958	4.70	4.27	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 560  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	726/1639	4.29	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	295/1639	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	4.88	4.58	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	281/1583	4.67	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	216/1532	4.30	4.00	4.01	4.05	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	313/1504	4.61	4.37	4.05	4.12	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	694/1612	4.33	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1023/1635	4.57	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	623/1579	4.24	4.24	4.08	4.07	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	170/1518	4.86	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.95	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1517	4.92	4.41	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	139/1550	4.67	4.34	4.22	4.20	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	185/1295	4.62	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	285/1398	4.20	4.48	4.07	4.13	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	227/1391	4.62	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1388	4.89	4.61	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	143/ 958	4.70	4.27	3.93	3.97	4.70	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	3.67	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101  
 Title TUTORING AND LITERACY  
 Instructor: HOVATTER, ALESI  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 561  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1639	4.94	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1639	4.94	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	165/1532	4.89	4.00	4.01	4.05	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1504	4.94	4.37	4.05	4.12	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.94	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.33	4.24	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.88	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	500/1550	4.63	4.34	4.22	4.20	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	87/ 958	4.86	4.27	3.93	3.97	4.86	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0103  
 Title TUTORING AND LITERACY  
 Instructor: HOVATTER, ALESI  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 562  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	4.94	4.51	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	4.94	4.32	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1532	4.89	4.00	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	4.94	4.37	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	4.94	4.78	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	4.33	4.24	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.68	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.13	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 0					
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0					
				I 0	Other 0				
				? 0					



Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101  
 Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO  
 Instructor: DANNA, S  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 563  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	508/1639	4.60	4.51	4.27	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	748/1639	4.35	4.32	4.22	4.20	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.58	4.28	4.26	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	741/1583	4.30	4.46	4.19	4.24	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	3	8	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	5	9	4.11	770/1504	4.11	4.37	4.05	4.12	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	469/1612	4.53	4.36	4.16	4.12	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	855/1635	4.78	4.78	4.65	4.66	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.24	4.08	4.07	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	863/1518	4.47	4.51	4.43	4.39	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.85	4.70	4.68	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.41	4.27	4.23	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	944/1550	4.20	4.34	4.22	4.20	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	2	4	3	6	3.87	761/1295	3.87	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.48	4.07	4.13	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.64	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.61	4.28	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	179/ 958	4.60	4.27	3.93	3.97	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 411 0101  
 Title READ CONTNT AREA II  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 564  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	2	8	6	4	3.36	1539/1639	3.36	4.51	4.27	4.42	3.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	7	8	3.91	1262/1639	3.91	4.32	4.22	4.29	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	19	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	6	10	4.09	946/1583	4.09	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	4	3	6	4	4	3.05	1416/1532	3.05	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	7	5	3.48	1226/1504	3.48	4.37	4.05	4.20	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	2	10	8	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	855/1635	4.77	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	4.24	4.08	4.21	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.51	4.43	4.51	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	328/1520	4.95	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	822/1517	4.32	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	3	4	9	3.84	1193/1550	3.84	4.34	4.22	4.24	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	428/1295	4.29	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1171/1398	3.38	4.48	4.07	4.23	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	719/1391	4.38	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	907/1388	4.13	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	694/ 958	3.57	4.27	3.93	4.24	3.57	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	4	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
				Required for Majors	0
				General	0
				Electives	0
				Other	21
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	24
				Major	0
				Non-major	24
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0101  
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 565  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	318/1639	4.78	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	191/1639	4.91	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.83	4.58	4.28	4.38	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1583	4.95	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	934/1532	4.22	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	291/1504	4.74	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	160/1612	4.80	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.64	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	125/1579	4.62	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	231/1550	4.88	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	2	2	8	4.23	474/1295	4.50	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	403/1398	4.77	4.48	4.07	4.23	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	321/1391	4.91	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	79/ 958	4.94	4.27	3.93	4.24	4.89	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	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 15 Non-major 16
84-150	4	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: EDUC 412 0201  
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR  
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 566  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	257/1639	4.78	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1639	4.91	4.32	4.22	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	4.83	4.58	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	143/1583	4.95	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	305/1532	4.22	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1504	4.74	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	197/1612	4.80	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1288/1635	4.64	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	496/1579	4.62	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	174/1550	4.88	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	124/1295	4.50	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1398	4.77	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	4.91	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 958	4.94	4.27	3.93	4.24	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 416 0101  
 Title MATERIALS TCH READ  
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 567  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1014/1639	4.10	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1318/1397	3.33	4.58	4.28	4.38	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	535/1532	4.30	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1010/1504	3.80	4.37	4.05	4.20	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1253/1612	3.80	4.36	4.16	4.18	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1635	4.80	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	1430/1579	3.22	4.24	4.08	4.21	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1324/1518	3.89	4.51	4.43	4.51	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	855/1520	4.78	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1193/1517	3.89	4.41	4.27	4.34	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1274/1550	3.67	4.34	4.22	4.24	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	368/1295	4.38	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	675/1398	4.20	4.48	4.07	4.23	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	863/1391	4.20	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1226/1388	3.40	4.61	4.28	4.50	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	682/ 958	3.60	4.27	3.93	4.24	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 417 0101  
 Title PROC & ACQUIS READ  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 568  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	293/1532	4.57	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	955/1612	4.13	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	760/1579	4.17	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	265/1295	4.50	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	694/1391	4.40	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 418 0101  
 Title INSTRUCTION OF READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 569  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1474/1612	3.25	4.36	4.16	4.18	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1618/1635	3.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1094/1518	4.25	4.51	4.43	4.51	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.89	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	783/1388	4.33	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	658/ 958	3.67	4.27	3.93	4.24	3.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.60	4.04	4.84	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 53	4.67	4.31	4.05	4.58	4.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	27/ 42	4.67	4.72	4.75	4.71	4.67	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	21/ 37	4.67	4.42	4.58	4.73	4.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.77	4.56	4.64	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0101  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 570  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1639	4.89	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	151/1583	4.89	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	236/1532	4.67	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.37	4.05	4.20	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	139/1612	4.86	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1635	4.78	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	159/1579	4.78	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	135/1295	4.75	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.88	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 420 0101  
 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 571  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.51	4.27	4.42	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1618/1639	2.67	4.32	4.22	4.29	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1268/1397	3.50	4.58	4.28	4.38	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	1532/1583	3.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	989/1532	3.80	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1154/1504	3.60	4.37	4.05	4.20	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1488/1612	3.20	4.36	4.16	4.18	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1541/1579	2.67	4.24	4.08	4.21	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1183/1398	3.33	4.48	4.07	4.23	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1320/1388	3.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	563/ 958	3.83	4.27	3.93	4.24	3.83

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	6	Non-major	6
84-150	1	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 421 0101  
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SC  
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 572  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	508/1639	4.60	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	915/1639	4.20	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	667/1504	4.20	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1441/1612	3.40	4.36	4.16	4.18	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.40
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	806/ 958	3.25	4.27	3.93	4.24	3.25

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

Course-Section: EDUC 422 0101  
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES: ELEM S  
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 573  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	423/1583	4.56	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	607/1532	4.22	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1195/1635	4.44	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1071/1579	3.89	4.24	4.08	4.21	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.51	4.43	4.51	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	875/1550	4.29	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1295	4.75	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	386/1398	4.57	4.48	4.07	4.23	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.27	3.93	4.24	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 424 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN EC CURRICULU  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 574  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	508/1639	4.60	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.58	4.28	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	1	1	4	3.10	1409/1532	3.10	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1612	4.89	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	1010/1550	4.13	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1229/1295	2.67	3.89	3.94	4.01	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1398	4.78	4.48	4.07	4.23	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1388	4.89	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.27	3.93	4.24	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.39	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.34	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 425 0101  
 Title TCHNG ENGLISH:SEC SCHO  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 575  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1474/1612	3.25	4.36	4.16	4.18	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.51	4.43	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.24	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	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 426 0101  
 Title MATH IN SECONDARY SCHO  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 576  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.50	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.27	3.93	4.24	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 427 0101  
 Title SCIENCE:SECONDARY SCHO  
 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 577  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1419/1518	3.50	4.51	4.43	4.51	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1260/1517	3.75	4.41	4.27	4.34	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1237/1550	3.75	4.34	4.22	4.24	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1295	4.75	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	951/ 958	1.00	4.27	3.93	4.24	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 428 0101  
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES: SEC SC  
 Instructor: JAKOVICS, KIMBE  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 578  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	400/1397	4.63	4.58	4.28	4.38	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	466/1504	4.43	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	955/1612	4.13	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	706/1635	4.88	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1579	4.83	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	275/1517	4.78	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	155/1295	4.71	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 429 0101  
 Title TEACH FORGN LANG SEC S  
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 579  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1358/1639	3.75	4.51	4.27	4.42	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1357/1639	3.75	4.32	4.22	4.29	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1532/1583	3.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1340/1504	3.25	4.37	4.05	4.20	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1541/1579	2.67	4.24	4.08	4.21	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1094/1518	4.25	4.51	4.43	4.51	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1347/1517	3.50	4.41	4.27	4.34	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1402/1550	3.25	4.34	4.22	4.24	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.89	3.94	4.01	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.48	4.07	4.23	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	4.27	3.93	4.24	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 442 0101  
 Title PROCESS SEM ECE - MEDI  
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 580  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1532	4.80	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	491/1504	4.40	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	388/1612	4.60	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1067/1295	3.33	3.89	3.94	4.01	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 443 0101  
 Title PROCESS SEM: ECE-M/S I  
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 581  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	355/1583	4.63	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	419/1532	4.43	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	514/1504	4.38	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1579	4.80	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.51	4.43	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	451/1517	4.63	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	3.89	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	91/ 958	4.83	4.27	3.93	4.24	4.83	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	4.84	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	8
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	7

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 444 0101  
 Title TCHNG PROB SOLVNG:ECE  
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 582  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1583	4.78	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	416/1518	4.78	4.51	4.43	4.51	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1295	****	3.89	3.94	4.01	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.27	3.93	4.24	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.39	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.34	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.02	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.64	****	

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
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 10
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 10

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 446 0101  
 Title LANG, LIT, & INT. DEV  
 Instructor: ROBERTS, HILARY  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 583  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	248/1639	4.82	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	284/1639	4.73	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	143/1583	4.90	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	388/1532	4.45	4.00	4.01	4.07	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	111/1504	4.91	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1155/1579	3.78	4.24	4.08	4.21	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1518	4.82	4.51	4.43	4.51	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	335/1517	4.73	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	388/1550	4.73	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1035/1295	3.40	3.89	3.94	4.01	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	87/ 958	4.86	4.27	3.93	4.24	4.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.39	4.58	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 451 0101  
 Title INTERNSHIP SEM:ECE  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 584  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	391/1639	4.70	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1639	4.90	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	151/1583	4.89	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	926/1532	3.89	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1504	4.89	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1612	4.89	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1517	4.86	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	3	0	1	0	2	2.67	1229/1295	2.67	3.89	3.94	4.01	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1398	4.86	4.48	4.07	4.23	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.64	4.30	4.48	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.61	4.28	4.50	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	91/ 958	4.83	4.27	3.93	4.24	4.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.39	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.34	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 453 0101  
 Title ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR  
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 585  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.37	4.05	4.20	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.78	4.65	4.72	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.89	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.27	3.93	4.24	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.60	4.04	4.84	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.31	4.05	4.58	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.72	4.75	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.42	4.58	4.73	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.77	4.56	4.64	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 471 0101  
 Title PRIN OF TRAINING AND D  
 Instructor: MCSHANE, RYAN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 586  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	1	6	3.90	1252/1639	3.90	4.51	4.27	4.42	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	1276/1532	3.44	4.00	4.01	4.07	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.37	4.05	4.20	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	882/1612	4.20	4.36	4.16	4.18	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.24	4.08	4.21	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1189/1518	4.13	4.51	4.43	4.51	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.85	4.70	4.75	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1007/1517	4.13	4.41	4.27	4.34	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	753/1295	3.88	3.89	3.94	4.01	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	****	4.27	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 601 0101  
 Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI  
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 587  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	8	7	3.95	1195/1639	3.95	4.51	4.27	4.42	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	7	6	4	3.48	1493/1639	3.48	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	4	8	3.67	1324/1583	3.67	4.46	4.19	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	2	4	6	1	2.68	1484/1532	2.68	4.00	4.01	4.10	2.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	5	6	4	3.47	1226/1504	3.47	4.37	4.05	4.29	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	4	9	4.05	1010/1612	4.05	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	3	1	1	14	4.37	1265/1635	4.37	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	4	7	2	3.53	1303/1579	3.53	4.24	4.08	4.17	3.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	1324/1518	3.89	4.51	4.43	4.49	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	943/1520	4.72	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	6	7	6	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	6	3	3	2.94	1454/1550	2.94	4.34	4.22	4.23	2.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	3	4	5	4	3.33	1067/1295	3.33	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	5	5	6	3.68	1016/1398	3.68	4.48	4.07	4.22	3.68	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	4	3	10	4.05	959/1391	4.05	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.05	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	721/1388	4.42	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	747/ 958	3.45	4.27	3.93	4.01	3.45	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.74	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	80/ 85	3.38	4.39	4.58	4.58	3.38	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	75/ 82	3.63	4.53	4.52	4.74	3.63	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	2	0	1	3	3.13	77/ 78	3.13	4.34	4.47	4.52	3.13	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	2	0	3	3.25	77/ 80	3.25	4.25	4.47	4.50	3.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	4	1	1	2	3.13	70/ 82	3.13	4.35	4.16	4.37	3.13	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	2	1	0	3	3.29	43/ 52	3.29	4.60	4.04	3.64	3.29	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	1	2	3	0	3.00	44/ 53	3.00	4.31	4.05	4.03	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	3.67	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0101  
 Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI  
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 587  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	6	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101  
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 588  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	257/1639	4.78	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	915/1639	4.60	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	371/1583	4.80	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1532	4.75	4.00	4.01	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	291/1504	4.80	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	632/1612	4.70	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.67	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.90	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.90	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	522/1550	4.80	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	346/1295	4.45	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	426/1398	4.75	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1391	4.75	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0201  
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV  
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 589  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	318/1639	4.78	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	4.60	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	4.80	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	335/1532	4.75	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.80	4.37	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	4.70	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1579	4.67	4.24	4.08	4.17	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	4.90	4.51	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	4.90	4.41	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	4.80	4.34	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	265/1295	4.45	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	4.75	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	4.75	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1639	4.88	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1583	4.88	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	469/1532	4.38	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	514/1504	4.38	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	656/1518	4.63	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1087/1520	4.63	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.88	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	208/1550	4.88	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	561/1295	4.13	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	494/1398	4.43	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	678/1391	4.43	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	0	0	5	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	3.67	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.31	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 8
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 9
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 5

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 605 8010  
 Title THE ADULT LEARNER  
 Instructor: RAUDENBUSH, LIN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 591  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	508/1639	4.60	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	813/1639	4.30	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	597/1583	4.40	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	700/1532	4.10	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	491/1504	4.40	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	756/1612	4.30	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	535/1517	4.56	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	920/1550	4.22	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1388	4.70	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	325/ 958	4.30	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 85	4.67	4.39	4.58	4.58	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	40/ 82	4.67	4.53	4.52	4.74	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 78	4.67	4.34	4.47	4.52	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	52/ 80	4.33	4.25	4.47	4.50	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	30/ 82	4.67	4.35	4.16	4.37	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	44/ 50	3.67	3.67	4.45	4.39	3.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	22/ 32	4.00	4.00	4.51	4.50	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.42	****	

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	3	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	6	
?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101  
 Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 592  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	780/1639	4.38	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1281/1639	3.88	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	469/1532	4.38	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1501/1612	3.14	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	919/1518	4.43	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	854/1517	4.29	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	556/1550	4.57	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	532/1398	4.38	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	919/1391	4.13	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	907/1388	4.13	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	171/ 958	4.63	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.39	4.58	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101  
 Title INSTRUCT READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 593  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1287/1639	3.87	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	852/1583	4.20	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	2	6	3.60	1360/1612	3.60	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	9	3	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	760/1579	4.17	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	648/1517	4.46	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	1	3	4	1	3.09	1149/1295	3.09	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	502/1398	4.42	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	693/1388	4.45	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	131/ 958	4.73	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	5.00	4.18	4.74	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	26/ 52	4.69	4.60	4.04	3.64	4.69	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	5	2	5	3.85	39/ 53	3.85	4.31	4.05	4.03	3.85	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	1	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	37/ 42	4.33	4.72	4.75	4.78	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	33/ 37	3.92	4.42	4.58	4.33	3.92	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	16/ 32	4.58	4.77	4.56	4.59	4.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 7
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 15
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 13

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 615 0101  
 Title MATERIALS TEACH READ  
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 594  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1384/1639	3.71	4.51	4.27	4.42	3.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1381/1639	3.71	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	1.75	1397/1397	1.75	4.58	4.28	4.37	1.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	3.29	1477/1583	3.29	4.46	4.19	4.31	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	0	3	3.43	1288/1532	3.43	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1303/1504	3.33	4.37	4.05	4.29	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	913/1612	4.17	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	736/1635	4.86	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1541/1579	2.67	4.24	4.08	4.17	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	1414/1520	4.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1442/1517	3.14	4.41	4.27	4.32	3.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	2.43	1498/1550	2.43	4.34	4.22	4.23	2.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1067/1295	3.33	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	1	0	2.29	1377/1398	2.29	4.48	4.07	4.22	2.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	3.14	1300/1391	3.14	4.64	4.30	4.47	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	1320/1388	3.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	888/ 958	2.80	4.27	3.93	4.01	2.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 621 0101  
 Title INST STRAT/INTEG ECE C  
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 595  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1583	4.80	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	989/1532	3.80	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	388/1612	4.60	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.80	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	3.89	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.60	4.04	3.64	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	15/ 53	4.75	4.31	4.05	4.03	4.75	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 42	4.50	4.72	4.75	4.78	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	29/ 37	4.25	4.42	4.58	4.33	4.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	15/ 32	4.67	4.77	4.56	4.59	4.67	

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	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 622 0101  
 Title INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 596  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1536/1639	3.33	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1318/1397	3.33	4.58	4.28	4.37	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1532/1583	3.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1524/1532	2.00	4.00	4.01	4.10	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1471/1504	2.67	4.37	4.05	4.29	2.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1390/1579	3.33	4.24	4.08	4.17	3.33	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1512/1518	2.00	4.51	4.43	4.49	2.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1519/1520	2.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	2.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1515/1517	1.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	1.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1549/1550	1.00	4.34	4.22	4.23	1.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1293/1295	1.00	3.89	3.94	3.95	1.00	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.48	4.07	4.22	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1130/1388	3.67	4.61	4.28	4.49	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101  
 Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S  
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 597  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	163/1639	4.86	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	133/1532	4.83	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.37	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.71	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	87/ 958	4.86	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.43	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	5.00	4.11	3.96	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 219	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.72	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.74	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.39	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 82	4.50	4.53	4.52	4.74	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.34	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.25	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.35	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 52	4.50	4.60	4.04	3.64	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 53	4.50	4.31	4.05	4.03	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.72	4.75	4.78	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	31/ 37	4.00	4.42	4.58	4.33	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	3.67	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101  
 Title INSTRUC STRIGY TEACH S  
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 597  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 625 0101  
 Title TEACH READ WRIT ESL I  
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 598  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	214/1639	4.86	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	220/1639	4.79	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	705/1397	4.36	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	339/1583	4.64	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	178/1532	4.75	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	100/1504	4.92	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	150/1612	4.83	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	538/1579	4.36	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	670/1518	4.62	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.93	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	709/1295	3.93	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	234/1398	4.79	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	356/1391	4.79	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	459/1388	4.69	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	89/ 958	4.85	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.85	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.39	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.74	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 9
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Major 12
				P 0	Non-major 2
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 13
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: EDUC 627 0101  
 Title INS STRAT FL SEC SCH  
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 599  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	173/1583	4.83	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	236/1532	4.67	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	695/1398	4.17	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	887/1391	4.17	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	887/1388	4.17	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	399/ 958	4.17	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 628 0101  
 Title INST STRAT:TCHG SEC MA  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 600  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1406/1583	3.50	4.46	4.19	4.31	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1106/1398	3.50	4.48	4.07	4.22	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	4.27	3.93	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101  
 Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S  
 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 601  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1327/1612	3.67	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	800/1517	4.33	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 632 0101  
 Title INST STRAT:TCHG SEC EN  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 602  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	508/1639	4.60	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	667/1504	4.20	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1235/1635	4.40	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1579	4.80	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.80	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	380/ 958	4.20	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 636 0101  
 Title ESL/FOR LANG TEST & EV  
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 603  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	404/1639	4.68	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	382/1639	4.63	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	392/1397	4.63	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	402/1583	4.58	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	366/1532	4.47	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	14	4.53	351/1504	4.53	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	2	14	4.47	532/1612	4.47	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	301/1518	4.84	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	699/1520	4.84	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	439/1517	4.63	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	556/1550	4.58	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	953/1295	3.56	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	525/1398	4.39	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	662/1391	4.44	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	558/1388	4.61	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	430/ 958	4.12	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.12	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 642 0101  
 Title ECE MATH/SCI PROCESSES  
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 604  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	612/1504	4.25	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 85	4.00	4.39	4.58	4.58	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.53	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	53/ 78	4.00	4.34	4.47	4.52	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 80	4.00	4.25	4.47	4.50	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.35	4.16	4.37	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 644 0101  
 Title LING/ESOL EDUCATORS  
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 605  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	186/1583	4.80	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	178/1532	4.75	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	275/1504	4.63	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	706/1635	4.88	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	450/1579	4.44	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	629/1518	4.64	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.93	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	690/1550	4.47	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	590/1295	4.07	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	391/1398	4.56	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	719/1391	4.38	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	234/ 958	4.45	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		8
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101  
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 606  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	2	2	4	1	8	3.65	1428/1639	3.65	4.51	4.27	4.42	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	2	3	3	6	3.41	1517/1639	3.41	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	3	0	4	3	7	3.65	1338/1583	3.65	4.46	4.19	4.31	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	5	1	7	3.69	1120/1532	3.69	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	3	1	4	6	3.56	1177/1504	3.56	4.37	4.05	4.29	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	5	1	4	2	5	3.06	1515/1612	3.06	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	1318/1635	4.29	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1163/1579	3.77	4.24	4.08	4.17	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	2	3	1	4	3.45	1430/1518	3.45	4.51	4.43	4.49	3.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	1	0	5	0	4	3.60	1310/1517	3.60	4.41	4.27	4.32	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	2	1	3	3.20	1411/1550	3.20	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1089/1295	3.29	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	572/1391	4.56	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	546/1388	4.63	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	1	0	5	1	2	3.33	81/ 85	3.33	4.39	4.58	4.58	3.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	65/ 82	4.25	4.53	4.52	4.74	4.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	72/ 78	3.44	4.34	4.47	4.52	3.44	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	74/ 80	3.44	4.25	4.47	4.50	3.44	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	77/ 82	2.56	4.35	4.16	4.37	2.56	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	53	****	4.31	4.05	4.03	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 2	A 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate 4	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1	General	0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 19
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0				
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 4	F 0				
			P 0				
			I 0				
			? 0	Other	11		

Course-Section: EDUC 654 0101  
 Title PROC & ACQUIS LANG & L  
 Instructor: ROBERTS, HILARY  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 607  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.83	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	655/1532	4.17	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1504	4.83	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	150/1612	4.83	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	459/1295	4.25	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	200/1398	4.83	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	296/1388	4.83	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	99/ 958	4.80	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 659 0101  
 Title READ CONTNT AREA II  
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 608  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1082/1639	4.08	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	583/1639	4.46	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	625/1583	4.38	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1081/1532	3.73	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	713/1504	4.15	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	207/1612	4.77	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1114/1635	4.54	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	473/1579	4.43	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	141/1517	4.92	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	1	8	4.17	529/1295	4.17	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	586/1388	4.58	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	424/ 958	4.13	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.13	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 663 0101  
 Title ELEM SOC STUD METH  
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 609  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1579	3.50	4.24	4.08	4.17	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.00	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 664 0101  
 Title SEC SOC STUD METH  
 Instructor: JAKOVICS, KIMBE  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 610  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.00	4.01	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	182/1504	4.75	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1612	4.75	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.33	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	185/1295	4.67	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 665 0101  
 Title CREATIVE MEDIA-ECE  
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 611  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	236/1532	4.67	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	200/1398	4.83	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 612  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	469/1639	4.64	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	1021/1639	4.09	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	417/1397	4.60	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	654/1583	4.36	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	441/1532	4.40	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	976/1612	4.10	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1396/1635	4.20	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	332/1579	4.56	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	769/1550	4.40	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	285/1398	4.73	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	459/1388	4.70	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	111/ 958	4.78	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.78	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.39	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.34	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 7	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 9
				? 0	

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101  
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS  
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 613  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1042/1639	4.13	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	1044/1639	4.06	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	862/1583	4.19	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	934/1532	3.88	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	453/1504	4.44	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	589/1612	4.44	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.94	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	1163/1579	3.77	4.24	4.08	4.17	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	978/1518	4.38	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	1006/1520	4.69	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	956/1517	4.19	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	7	4	3.88	1177/1550	3.88	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	513/1295	4.19	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	6	4.06	749/1398	4.06	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	670/1391	4.44	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	834/1388	4.25	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	5	5	4	3.80	577/ 958	3.80	4.27	3.93	4.01	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.39	4.58	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 681 8010  
 Title SURV OF INSTR TECH APP  
 Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 614  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1513/1639	3.43	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	661/1397	4.40	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	761/1583	4.29	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.50	4.37	4.05	4.29	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1257/1579	3.56	4.24	4.08	4.17	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1334/1518	3.86	4.51	4.43	4.49	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	1439/1517	3.17	4.41	4.27	4.32	3.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	0	2	2	3.00	1440/1550	3.00	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	768/1295	3.86	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1198/1398	3.29	4.48	4.07	4.22	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1300/1391	3.14	4.64	4.30	4.47	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1297/1388	3.14	4.61	4.28	4.49	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	917/ 958	2.50	4.27	3.93	4.01	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.34	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 681 8010  
 Title SURV OF INSTR TECH APP  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 615  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1513/1639	3.43	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	661/1397	4.40	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	761/1583	4.29	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.50	4.37	4.05	4.29	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1579	3.56	4.24	4.08	4.17	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1518	3.86	4.51	4.43	4.49	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1198/1398	3.29	4.48	4.07	4.22	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1300/1391	3.14	4.64	4.30	4.47	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1297/1388	3.14	4.61	4.28	4.49	3.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	917/ 958	2.50	4.27	3.93	4.01	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	5.00	4.35	4.72	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.34	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	2

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101  
 Title: METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL  
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 616  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	120/1639	4.24	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	89/1639	3.95	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1397	4.42	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	181/1583	4.12	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	774/1532	4.06	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	150/1504	3.96	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	79/1612	3.87	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	159/1579	3.80	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	345/1518	4.02	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1520	4.82	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	230/1517	3.83	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	208/1550	3.88	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	2	0	0	2	3	3.57	943/1295	3.59	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	408/1398	4.03	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	417/1391	4.59	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	496/1388	4.53	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	163/ 958	3.78	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.64	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.60	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	3.29	4.31	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	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: EDUC 688 8720  
 Title: METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL  
 Instructor: WILSON, M.  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 617  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	990/1639	4.24	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	7	2	6	3.61	1438/1639	3.95	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1397	4.42	4.58	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	6	4.06	974/1583	4.12	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	655/1532	4.06	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	4	6	4	3.56	1183/1504	3.96	4.37	4.05	4.29	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	2	4	2	8	3.67	1327/1612	3.87	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	4	6	3	3.79	1148/1579	3.80	4.24	4.08	4.17	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	8	5	3.94	1285/1518	4.02	4.51	4.43	4.49	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	725/1520	4.82	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	7	1	7	3.67	1292/1517	3.83	4.41	4.27	4.32	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	5	5	4	3.44	1352/1550	3.88	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	5	8	3	3.67	894/1295	3.59	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	895/1398	4.03	4.48	4.07	4.22	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	534/1391	4.59	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	783/1388	4.53	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	8	6	1	3.38	776/ 958	3.78	4.27	3.93	4.01	3.38	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	65/ 85	4.33	4.39	4.58	4.58	4.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 78	****	4.34	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	76/ 80	3.33	4.25	4.47	4.50	3.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	2	2	0	0	1	2.20	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	32/ 52	4.00	4.60	4.04	3.64	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	43/ 53	3.29	4.31	4.05	4.03	3.29	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	Other 12
				? 1	

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 688 8721  
 Title: METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL  
 Instructor: PLATT, HEIDI  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 618  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1447/1639	4.24	4.51	4.27	4.42	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	1	3.31	1542/1639	3.95	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1125/1397	4.42	4.58	4.28	4.37	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	7	1	3.50	1406/1583	4.12	4.46	4.19	4.31	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	774/1532	4.06	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	2	3	4	3.54	1194/1504	3.96	4.37	4.05	4.29	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	1	4	3	1	3.00	1519/1612	3.87	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	7	2	0	2.83	1521/1579	3.80	4.24	4.08	4.17	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	2	4	3	3.31	1453/1518	4.02	4.51	4.43	4.49	3.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	1101/1520	4.82	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	2	3	2	3.00	1453/1517	3.83	4.41	4.27	4.32	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	2	4	3.31	1393/1550	3.88	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	3	1	4	4	3.54	963/1295	3.59	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1030/1398	4.03	4.48	4.07	4.22	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	686/1391	4.59	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	586/1388	4.53	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	3	4	2	3.33	786/ 958	3.78	4.27	3.93	4.01	3.33	

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	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 771T 8030  
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED  
 Instructor: CURRAN, KEITH G  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 619  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1524/1532	2.00	4.00	4.01	4.10	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.37	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.17	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.89	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1320/1388	3.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 781 8720  
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 620  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	4	1	3.09	1591/1639	3.09	4.51	4.27	4.42	3.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	6	2	1	3.00	1579/1639	3.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1158/1583	3.91	4.46	4.19	4.31	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1081/1532	3.73	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1135/1504	3.64	4.37	4.05	4.29	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	5	4	3.91	1175/1612	3.91	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.91	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1364/1579	3.40	4.24	4.08	4.17	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	1514/1518	1.80	4.51	4.43	4.49	1.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1273/1520	4.40	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	2	2	1	0	0	1.80	1512/1517	1.80	4.41	4.27	4.32	1.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1546/1550	1.60	4.34	4.22	4.23	1.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1209/1295	2.83	3.89	3.94	3.95	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	1201/1398	3.27	4.48	4.07	4.22	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	616/1388	4.55	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	2	0	0	6	3	3.73	629/ 958	3.73	4.27	3.93	4.01	3.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	75/ 85	3.90	4.39	4.58	4.58	3.90	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	68/ 82	4.10	4.53	4.52	4.74	4.10	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	70/ 78	3.60	4.34	4.47	4.52	3.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	3	3.50	71/ 80	3.50	4.25	4.47	4.50	3.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	63/ 82	3.60	4.35	4.16	4.37	3.60	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 8
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	6

Course-Section: EDUC 781S 2301  
 Title  
 Instructor: BRADSHAW, FELIC  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 621  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.58	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.00	4.01	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.37	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.24	4.08	4.17	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.51	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.34	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.89	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	5.00	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	5.00	4.44	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.39	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.53	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.34	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.25	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.35	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	21/ 52	4.86	4.60	4.04	3.64	4.86	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	13/ 53	4.83	4.31	4.05	4.03	4.83	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.72	4.75	4.78	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	18/ 37	4.86	4.42	4.58	4.33	4.86	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	14/ 32	4.86	4.77	4.56	4.59	4.86	

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	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	5				



Course-Section: EDUC 782 0101  
 Title ISSUES IN ECE  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 622  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	0	1	2	2.83	1468/1532	2.83	4.00	4.01	4.10	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	150/1612	4.83	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	760/1579	4.17	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	947/1518	4.40	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1241/1517	3.80	4.41	4.27	4.32	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.39	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.53	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.34	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.25	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.35	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.59	****	

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



Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101  
 Title PRACTICUM IN ED SEC 7-  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 623  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	582/1639	4.53	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	1326/1639	3.80	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	832/1583	4.21	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	9	4.07	729/1532	4.07	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	780/1504	4.08	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	3	3.53	1387/1612	3.53	4.36	4.16	4.27	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	847/1579	4.08	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1518	****	4.51	4.43	4.49	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1517	****	4.41	4.27	4.32	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1550	****	4.34	4.22	4.23	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	1	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1132/1295	3.17	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	189/1398	4.86	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	2	2	9	4.36	296/ 958	4.36	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	61/ 85	4.43	4.39	4.58	4.58	4.43	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	67/ 82	4.14	4.53	4.52	4.74	4.14	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	1	8	4.21	51/ 78	4.21	4.34	4.47	4.52	4.21	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	41/ 80	4.57	4.25	4.47	4.50	4.57	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	2	0	6	6	4.14	48/ 82	4.14	4.35	4.16	4.37	4.14	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	26/ 52	4.69	4.60	4.04	3.64	4.69	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	28/ 53	4.23	4.31	4.05	4.03	4.23	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	3	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	39/ 42	4.22	4.72	4.75	4.78	4.22	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	2	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	30/ 37	4.18	4.42	4.58	4.33	4.18	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	6	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	23/ 32	4.29	4.77	4.56	4.59	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 4	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	14

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 791S 0101  
 Title PRAC IN ED TESOL K-12  
 Instructor: ANAND, SUPREET  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 624  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	838/1295	3.75	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	887/1388	4.17	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101  
 Title INT IN EDU TESOL K-12  
 Instructor: STEIN, HOLLIS G  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 625  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.32	4.22	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1583	4.80	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1504	4.80	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1579	4.80	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.41	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1237/1550	3.75	4.34	4.22	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1295	****	3.89	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.48	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.39	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.53	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.34	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.25	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.35	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.60	4.04	3.64	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.31	4.05	4.03	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.72	4.75	4.78	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	22/ 37	4.50	4.42	4.58	4.33	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	4.77	4.56	4.59	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 794 0101  
 Title ISD PROJECT SEMINAR  
 Instructor: KINERNEY, DONNA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 626  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	173/1583	4.83	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	2	4	3.45	1270/1532	3.45	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	569/1579	4.33	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1518	****	4.51	4.43	4.49	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1398	****	4.48	4.07	4.22	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1391	****	4.64	4.30	4.47	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1388	****	4.61	4.28	4.49	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	4.27	3.93	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	41/ 85	4.83	4.39	4.58	4.58	4.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	43/ 82	4.58	4.53	4.52	4.74	4.58	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	41/ 78	4.67	4.34	4.47	4.52	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	41/ 80	4.58	4.25	4.47	4.50	4.58	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	28/ 82	4.75	4.35	4.16	4.37	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 795 8720  
 Title SEM STUDY TEACHING  
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 627  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	929/1639	4.43	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	241/1639	4.71	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	281/1583	4.74	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	1	2	1	5	3.33	1330/1532	3.84	4.00	4.01	4.10	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	222/1504	4.76	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	756/1612	4.45	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1635	4.88	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	427/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	397/1518	4.83	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	428/1517	4.73	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	638/1550	4.66	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	421/1295	4.23	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	234/1398	4.83	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	279/1391	4.93	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	179/1388	4.96	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	260/ 958	4.55	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.42	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	41/ 85	4.83	4.39	4.58	4.58	4.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.53	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.34	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.25	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.35	4.16	4.37	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 795 8721  
 Title SEM STUDY TEACHING  
 Instructor: MURDOCK, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 628  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	456/1639	4.43	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	371/1639	4.71	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.58	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	228/1583	4.74	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	488/1532	3.84	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	142/1504	4.76	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	408/1612	4.45	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	884/1635	4.88	4.78	4.65	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	342/1579	4.50	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	257/1518	4.83	4.51	4.43	4.49	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	230/1517	4.73	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	276/1550	4.66	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	545/1295	4.23	3.89	3.94	3.95	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	177/1398	4.83	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1391	4.93	4.64	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1388	4.96	4.61	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	147/ 958	4.55	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.69	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	4.83	4.39	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 82	5.00	4.53	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 78	5.00	4.34	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 80	5.00	4.25	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 82	5.00	4.35	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.60	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.31	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.72	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.42	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.77	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	3.67	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	Major
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	General 0
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Under-grad 11
				P 0	Non-major 17
				I 0	Electives 0
					Other 16

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: EDUC 796 8010  
 Title HUMAN PERF TECH  
 Instructor: ERDMAN, CAROL B  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 629  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1055/1639	4.11	4.51	4.27	4.42	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1274/1639	3.89	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	722/1397	4.33	4.58	4.28	4.37	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	929/1583	4.11	4.46	4.19	4.31	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	701/1504	4.17	4.37	4.05	4.29	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.36	4.16	4.27	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.78	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	806/1579	4.13	4.24	4.08	4.17	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1324/1518	3.89	4.51	4.43	4.49	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1016/1517	4.11	4.41	4.27	4.32	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	796/1550	4.38	4.34	4.22	4.23	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1132/1295	3.17	3.89	3.94	3.95	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1398	4.44	4.48	4.07	4.22	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.64	4.30	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.88	4.61	4.28	4.49	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	334/ 958	4.29	4.27	3.93	4.01	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 4 Major 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	5 Under-grad 5 Non-major 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant



Course-Section: EDUC 798 0101  
 Title Elem Teacher Seminar  
 Instructor: Bourne, Barbara  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 17  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	824/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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