

Course-Section: EDUC 299 2  
 Title Special Topics In Educ  
 Instructor: Danna,Sandra  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 498  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	351/1509	4.71	4.41	4.31	4.34	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	972/1509	4.14	4.36	4.26	4.32	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1247/1287	3.00	4.74	4.30	4.35	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.47	4.22	4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	187/1406	4.71	4.29	4.09	4.09	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1076/1384	3.71	4.35	4.11	4.09	3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.42	4.17	4.19	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	3.43	1488/1506	3.43	4.75	4.67	4.61	3.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	1021/1463	3.86	4.19	4.09	4.08	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	1047/1438	4.29	4.42	4.46	4.48	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	713/1411	4.43	4.41	4.31	4.37	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1405	4.71	4.31	4.32	4.39	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	536/1236	4.20	4.04	4.00	4.11	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.44	4.14	4.19	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.44	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.43	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 310 1  
 Title Inquiry Into Education  
 Instructor: Oliva,Linda M  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 499  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	8	9	7	3.73	1311/1509	3.92	4.41	4.31	4.32	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	10	6	7	3.65	1310/1509	3.48	4.36	4.26	4.25	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	1	2	4	4	4.43	614/1287	4.43	4.74	4.30	4.33	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	7	7	9	3.84	1135/1459	3.70	4.47	4.22	4.26	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	5	5	7	7	3.56	1155/1406	3.34	4.29	4.09	4.12	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	7	6	10	3.88	954/1384	4.00	4.35	4.11	4.15	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	5	12	4.00	986/1489	3.85	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	990/1506	4.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	12	6	1	3.30	1323/1463	2.95	4.19	4.09	4.08	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	2	7	7	6	3.77	1308/1438	3.44	4.42	4.46	4.43	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	1072/1421	4.59	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	5	2	8	7	3.77	1197/1411	3.39	4.41	4.31	4.29	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	3	6	7	4	3.36	1301/1405	3.04	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	4	2	5	7	2	3.05	1123/1236	2.38	4.04	4.00	4.07	3.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	653/1260	3.71	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	707/1255	4.38	4.63	4.33	4.37	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	700/1258	4.01	4.67	4.38	4.42	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	2	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	372/ 873	3.97	4.43	4.03	4.08	4.18	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	33/ 48	4.23	4.81	4.39	4.61	4.13	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	4	0	1	3	3.38	45/ 48	3.52	4.64	4.41	4.34	3.38	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	5	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 47	3.40	4.71	4.51	4.62	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 47	2.80	4.54	4.18	4.47	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	2	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	****/ 44	3.00	4.37	4.32	4.40	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 20	Required for Majors 22
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F 0	Non-major 25
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 1	Other 0

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

Course-Section: EDUC 310 3  
 Title Inquiry Into Education  
 Instructor: Oliva,Linda M  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 500  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	1044/1509	3.92	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	1	1	4	3.30	1426/1509	3.48	4.36	4.26	4.25	3.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	4.43	4.74	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	1292/1459	3.70	4.47	4.22	4.26	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	3	0	3	3.11	1317/1406	3.34	4.29	4.09	4.12	3.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	742/1384	4.00	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	1	3	4	3.70	1219/1489	3.85	4.42	4.17	4.14	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	4	0	0	0	6	3.40	1489/1506	4.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	3.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1439/1463	2.95	4.19	4.09	4.08	2.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	0	3	3	1	3.11	1401/1438	3.44	4.42	4.46	4.43	3.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	1123/1421	4.59	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	1361/1411	3.39	4.41	4.31	4.29	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	0	2	0	2	2.71	1378/1405	3.04	4.31	4.32	4.32	2.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	5	1	0	0	1	1.71	1229/1236	2.38	4.04	4.00	4.07	1.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	1133/1260	3.71	4.44	4.14	4.22	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	665/1255	4.38	4.63	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	0	3	3.60	1126/1258	4.01	4.67	4.38	4.42	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	610/ 873	3.97	4.43	4.03	4.08	3.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	26/ 48	4.23	4.81	4.39	4.61	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	44/ 48	3.52	4.64	4.41	4.34	3.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	45/ 47	3.40	4.71	4.51	4.62	3.40
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	42/ 47	2.80	4.54	4.18	4.47	2.80
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	42/ 44	3.00	4.37	4.32	4.40	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 311 2  
 Title Psyc Foundation Of Edu  
 Instructor: Williams,Vickie  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 501  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	193/1509	4.93	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	116/1509	4.95	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	240/1287	4.77	4.74	4.30	4.33	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	173/1459	4.72	4.47	4.22	4.26	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	19	4.68	208/1406	4.84	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	103/1384	4.74	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	216/1489	4.20	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	762/1506	4.41	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	489/1463	4.36	4.19	4.09	4.08	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.42	4.46	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	69/1411	4.95	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	239/1405	4.84	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	322/1236	4.45	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	223/1260	4.89	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	246/1255	4.93	4.63	4.33	4.37	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.42	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.17	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.52	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.30	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.86	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.67	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.63	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.73	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.34	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.62	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.54	4.18	4.47	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.37	4.32	4.40	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.25	4.14	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	5.00	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 311 2  
 Title Psyc Foundation Of Edu  
 Instructor: Williams, Vickie  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 501  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 311 3  
 Title Psyc Foundation Of Edu  
 Instructor: Singer,Jonathan  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 502  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.93	4.41	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.95	4.36	4.26	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	280/1459	4.72	4.47	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	4.84	4.29	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1384	4.74	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1236/1489	4.20	4.42	4.17	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.41	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	545/1463	4.36	4.19	4.09	4.08	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	4.89	4.44	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	4.93	4.63	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 313 1  
 Title Peer Assisted Lrning I  
 Instructor: Bichy,Cassie L  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 503  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	976/1509	4.17	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.47	4.22	4.26	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1307/1406	3.17	4.29	4.09	4.12	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	993/1384	3.83	4.35	4.11	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.42	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	4.19	4.09	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.42	4.46	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1163/1405	3.83	4.31	4.32	4.32	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.44	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.08	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 314 1  
 Title Peer Assisted Lrning I  
 Instructor: Bichy,Cassie L  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 504  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1265/1509	3.83	4.41	4.31	4.32	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.33	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.47	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1258/1406	3.33	4.29	4.09	4.12	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	993/1384	3.83	4.35	4.11	4.15	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	4.19	4.09	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.42	4.46	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.83	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	354/1236	4.40	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.42	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.08	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 388 1  
 Title Inclusion & Instructio  
 Instructor: Wilson-Craig,Es  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 505  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	12	4.27	862/1509	4.27	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	300/1509	4.71	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.74	4.30	4.33	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	182/1459	4.76	4.47	4.22	4.26	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	231/1406	4.65	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	6	13	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.35	4.11	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	16	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	832/1506	4.76	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	1	0	7	5	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	396/1438	4.79	4.42	4.46	4.43	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	562/1421	4.89	4.83	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	327/1411	4.74	4.41	4.31	4.29	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	381/1405	4.72	4.31	4.32	4.32	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.04	4.00	4.07	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.44	4.14	4.22	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1255	4.63	4.63	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.67	4.38	4.42	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	383/ 873	4.17	4.43	4.03	4.08	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: EDUC 411 1  
 Title Read Contnt Area II  
 Instructor: North-Coleman,C  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 506  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	1032/1509	4.32	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	952/1509	4.43	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	304/1287	4.61	4.74	4.30	4.38	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	8	4.28	748/1459	4.46	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	8	5	4.00	813/1406	4.13	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	807/1384	4.29	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	5	8	4.00	986/1489	4.25	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	883/1506	4.69	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	853/1463	4.23	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	1001/1438	4.58	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	716/1421	4.92	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	1051/1411	4.41	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1163/1405	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.34	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	1	4	11	4.33	421/1236	4.17	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	671/1260	4.37	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1255	4.63	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	421/1258	4.88	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	292/ 873	4.57	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 4 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 411 2  
 Title Read Contnt Area II  
 Instructor: Filbert, Teresa  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 507  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	574/1509	4.32	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	322/1509	4.43	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	519/1287	4.61	4.74	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	291/1459	4.46	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	4	11	4.26	575/1406	4.13	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	299/1384	4.29	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	2	15	4.50	458/1489	4.25	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	949/1506	4.69	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	410/1463	4.23	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	334/1438	4.58	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1421	4.92	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	222/1411	4.41	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	615/1405	4.18	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	2	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	664/1236	4.17	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	389/1260	4.37	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	474/1255	4.63	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1258	4.88	4.67	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	93/ 873	4.57	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 7 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 412 1  
 Title Analysis Of Tchng & Lr  
 Instructor: Williams,Vickie  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 508  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	778/1509	4.40	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	11	4.25	859/1509	4.33	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	519/1287	4.47	4.74	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	553/1459	4.53	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	611/1406	4.34	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	440/1384	4.31	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	1	2	15	4.58	376/1489	4.31	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	6	13	4.50	1070/1506	4.39	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	0	1	6	4	3.77	1092/1463	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.18	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	631/1438	4.54	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	537/1421	4.85	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	1	17	4.65	429/1411	4.54	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	1	15	4.35	808/1405	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	402/1236	4.40	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	621/1260	4.44	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	422/1255	4.63	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	350/1258	4.80	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	507/ 873	4.36	4.43	4.03	4.26	3.94
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	19/ 48	4.75	4.81	4.39	4.75	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	23/ 48	4.63	4.64	4.41	4.54	4.63
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	31/ 47	4.43	4.71	4.51	4.51	4.43
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	28/ 47	4.14	4.54	4.18	4.19	4.14
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	21/ 44	4.43	4.37	4.32	4.07	4.43
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	****	4.25	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: EDUC 412 1  
 Title Analysis Of Tchng & Lr  
 Instructor: Williams,Vickie  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 508  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	661/1509	4.40	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	3	14	4.41	699/1509	4.33	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	590/1287	4.47	4.74	4.30	4.38	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	335/1459	4.53	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	9	12	4.45	389/1406	4.34	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	12	4.23	649/1384	4.31	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	11	4.05	958/1489	4.31	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.05
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	6	4.27	1243/1506	4.39	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.27
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	489/1463	4.08	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	878/1438	4.54	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	794/1421	4.85	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	713/1411	4.54	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	671/1405	4.41	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	322/1236	4.40	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	330/1260	4.44	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	2	15	4.58	526/1255	4.63	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	386/1258	4.80	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	101/ 873	4.36	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	4.75	4.81	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 48	4.63	4.64	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	4.43	4.71	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 47	4.14	4.54	4.18	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	4.25	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.67	****

Course-Section: EDUC 412 2  
 Title Analysis Of Tchng & Lr  
 Instructor: Singer,Jonathan  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 509  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	10	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 417 1  
 Title Proc & Acquis Read  
 Instructor: Young,Patricia  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 510  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	540/1509	4.55	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	742/1509	4.37	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	472/1287	4.56	4.74	4.30	4.38	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	208/1384	4.68	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	979/1421	4.70	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	859/1405	4.30	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	481/1236	4.26	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	478/1260	4.44	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	278/1255	4.81	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	493/1258	4.69	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	229/ 873	4.47	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.47

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 6 Major 10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		



Course-Section: EDUC 418 1  
 Title Instruction Of Reading  
 Instructor: Filbert, Teresa  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 511  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.47	4.22	4.32	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.29	4.09	4.11	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.35	4.11	4.23	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.42	4.17	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.19	4.09	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.35	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.44	4.14	4.25	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.26	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 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 2	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 419 1  
 Title Assess Reading  
 Instructor: Shelton,Nancy R  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 512  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	184/1509	4.88	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	192/1509	4.81	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	127/1287	4.90	4.74	4.30	4.38	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	67/1459	4.93	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	103/1384	4.81	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	662/1506	4.87	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	81/1463	4.91	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.42	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	110/1411	4.92	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1405	4.92	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	158/1236	4.69	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1255	4.90	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	236/1258	4.90	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	74/ 873	4.90	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 16	Graduate	2	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	14	Non-major 16
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0					
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 2					

Course-Section: EDUC 420 1  
 Title Teach Math In Elem Sch  
 Instructor: Albright,Debora  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 513  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	95/1509	4.94	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	141/1509	4.88	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	141/1459	4.81	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	539/1406	4.29	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	55/1489	4.94	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	622/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	106/1463	4.83	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.42	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	429/1421	4.93	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	228/1405	4.86	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	229/1236	4.57	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	364/1260	4.58	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1255	4.92	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.26	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.54	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.54	4.18	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 421 1  
 Title Tchng Science: Elem Sc  
 Instructor: Blunck,Susan M  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 514  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	193/1509	4.87	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	240/1287	4.78	4.74	4.30	4.38	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	423/1406	4.43	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	140/1384	4.77	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	167/1489	4.79	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	466/1506	4.93	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	222/1463	4.64	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1438	****	4.42	4.46	4.50	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.83	4.73	4.76	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1411	****	4.41	4.31	4.35	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1405	****	4.31	4.32	4.34	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1236	****	4.04	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	109/1260	4.92	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	333/1255	4.77	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	189/1258	4.92	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	109/ 873	4.77	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.77
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	8	4.31	28/ 48	4.31	4.81	4.39	4.75	4.31
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	27/ 48	4.46	4.64	4.41	4.54	4.46
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	5	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	35/ 47	4.25	4.71	4.51	4.51	4.25
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	29/ 47	4.00	4.54	4.18	4.19	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	4	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	29/ 44	4.13	4.37	4.32	4.07	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 422 1  
 Title Social Studies: Elem S  
 Instructor: Fitzhugh,Willia  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 515  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	987/1509	4.15	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	0	9	4.15	962/1509	4.15	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	638/1459	4.38	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	434/1406	4.42	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	639/1384	4.23	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	513/1489	4.46	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.92	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	750/1438	4.55	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	768/1421	4.82	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	568/1411	4.55	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	0	0	8	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	248/1236	4.55	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	337/1260	4.63	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 3	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10	Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 424 1  
 Title Issues In Ec Curriculu  
 Instructor: Small,Sue E  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 516  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	952/1509	4.17	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	77/ 89	3.67	4.44	4.49	4.71	3.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.65	4.54	4.83	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	61/ 90	4.33	4.58	4.50	4.69	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	67/ 92	4.00	4.34	4.38	4.64	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	76/ 93	3.33	4.38	4.06	4.32	3.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.81	4.39	4.75	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.64	4.41	4.54	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.71	4.51	4.51	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.54	4.18	4.19	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	26/ 44	4.33	4.37	4.32	4.07	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 425 1  
 Title Tchng English:Sec Scho  
 Instructor: North-Coleman,C  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 517  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	852/1509	4.29	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	667/1509	4.43	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	586/1459	4.43	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	423/1406	4.43	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	718/1384	4.14	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	1141/1489	3.86	4.42	4.17	4.18	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	896/1506	4.71	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	750/1463	4.14	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	904/1438	4.43	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	665/1421	4.86	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	858/1411	4.29	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	974/1405	4.14	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	466/1236	4.29	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 2	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 5	Non-major 7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0				
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: EDUC 426 1  
 Title Math In Secondary Scho  
 Instructor: Smith,Amy M.  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 518  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	942/1509	4.20	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.36	4.26	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.47	4.22	4.32	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	269/1406	4.60	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	597/1489	4.40	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1300/1506	4.20	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.19	4.09	4.18	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.42	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	536/1236	4.20	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1260	****	4.44	4.14	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1255	****	4.63	4.33	4.46	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1258	****	4.67	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.43	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 2	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 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	2	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 427 1  
 Title Science:Secondary Scho  
 Instructor: Singer,Jonathan  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 519  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1228/1509	3.80	4.36	4.26	4.26	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	446/1406	4.40	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	440/1384	4.40	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1343/1489	3.40	4.42	4.17	4.18	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	211/1236	4.60	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.44	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	2	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	3	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	2	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 428 1  
 Title Social Studies: Sec Sc  
 Instructor: Coffman,Robert  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 520  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	540/1509	4.56	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.74	4.30	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	400/1459	4.56	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	223/1406	4.67	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.89	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	106/1463	4.83	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1411	4.89	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	194/1405	4.89	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	73/1236	4.89	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	272/1260	4.71	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	390/1255	4.71	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.86	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	187/ 873	4.57	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.57

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 1	Major 0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: EDUC 429 1  
 Title Teach Forgn Lang Sec S  
 Instructor: Arevalo-Guerrer  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 521  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1288/1509	3.80	4.41	4.31	4.39	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1331/1509	3.60	4.36	4.26	4.26	3.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1017/1384	3.80	4.35	4.11	4.23	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1176/1489	3.80	4.42	4.17	4.18	3.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	496/1411	4.60	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	758/1405	4.40	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1088/1236	3.20	4.04	4.00	4.03	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	746/1260	4.00	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	822/1255	4.20	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	4	4	2	1	2.69	1492/1509	2.69	4.41	4.31	4.39	2.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	3	4	1	1	2.50	1499/1509	2.50	4.36	4.26	4.26	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	6	2	2	3.25	1387/1459	3.25	4.47	4.22	4.32	3.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1258/1406	3.33	4.29	4.09	4.11	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	1	3	2.92	1341/1384	2.92	4.35	4.11	4.23	2.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	3	2	2	1	2.70	1444/1489	2.70	4.42	4.17	4.18	2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	917/1506	4.69	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	5	2	0	0	2.13	1452/1463	2.13	4.19	4.09	4.18	2.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	4	1	4	1	2.69	1424/1438	2.69	4.42	4.46	4.50	2.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	863/1421	4.77	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	5	2	1	1	2.23	1401/1411	2.23	4.41	4.31	4.35	2.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	4	1	0	2.23	1394/1405	2.23	4.31	4.32	4.34	2.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	4	3	3	2	1	2.46	1201/1236	2.46	4.04	4.00	4.03	2.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	4.44	4.14	4.25	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 873	****	4.43	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.54	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.37	4.32	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	Graduate 4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	Major 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General 0
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Under-grad 9
					Non-major 13
					Electives 0
					#### - Means there are not enough

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

Course-Section: EDUC 444 1  
 Title Tchng Prob Solvng:ECE  
 Instructor: Rivkin,Mary S  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 523  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	5	5	5	1	2.79	1487/1509	2.79	4.41	4.31	4.39	2.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	7	3	2	2.89	1483/1509	2.89	4.36	4.26	4.26	2.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	7	4	5	3.47	1322/1459	3.47	4.47	4.22	4.32	3.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	3	5	2	2.78	1371/1406	2.78	4.29	4.09	4.11	2.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	8	5	3.83	993/1384	3.83	4.35	4.11	4.23	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	7	4	1	2.88	1427/1489	2.88	4.42	4.17	4.18	2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	883/1506	4.72	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	5	6	3	2	3.13	1375/1463	3.13	4.19	4.09	4.18	3.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	5	5	6	2	3.16	1398/1438	3.16	4.42	4.46	4.50	3.16
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	1240/1421	4.37	4.83	4.73	4.76	4.37
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	7	7	0	3.05	1357/1411	3.05	4.41	4.31	4.35	3.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	9	3	5	0	2.58	1386/1405	2.58	4.31	4.32	4.34	2.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	4	6	3	5	0	2.50	1197/1236	2.50	4.04	4.00	4.03	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	5	2	1	3.10	1148/1260	3.10	4.44	4.14	4.25	3.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1013/1258	3.90	4.67	4.38	4.51	3.90
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	789/ 873	3.13	4.43	4.03	4.26	3.13
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	16/ 48	4.88	4.81	4.39	4.75	4.88
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	25/ 48	4.53	4.64	4.41	4.54	4.53
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	6	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	37/ 47	4.09	4.71	4.51	4.51	4.09
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	35/ 47	3.88	4.54	4.18	4.19	3.88
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	3	2	2	3	3	4	3.36	41/ 44	3.36	4.37	4.32	4.07	3.36

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	Graduate 8	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	Under-grad 11	Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0			
			I 0	Other		
			? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 446 1  
 Title Lang, Lit, & Int. Dev  
 Instructor: Scully, Patricia  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 524  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	95/1509	4.95	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	158/1509	4.85	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	346/1459	4.60	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	135/1406	4.80	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	74/1384	4.89	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	55/1489	4.95	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	84/1463	4.89	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	291/1438	4.85	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	190/1411	4.85	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	164/1236	4.68	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.68
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	236/1258	4.90	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	79/ 873	4.88	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 6 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 451 1  
 Title Internship Sem:ECE  
 Instructor: Small,Sue E  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 525  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.36	4.26	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.35	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/1236	4.75	4.04	4.00	4.03	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.44	4.14	4.25	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.63	4.33	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	721/1258	4.40	4.67	4.38	4.51	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.26	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	77/ 89	3.67	4.44	4.49	4.71	3.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.65	4.54	4.83	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	54/ 90	4.50	4.58	4.50	4.69	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	67/ 92	4.00	4.34	4.38	4.64	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	76/ 93	3.33	4.38	4.06	4.32	3.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.81	4.39	4.75	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.64	4.41	4.54	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.71	4.51	4.51	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.54	4.18	4.19	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	26/ 44	4.33	4.37	4.32	4.07	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 453 1  
 Title Elem Inetrnshp Seminar  
 Instructor: Bourne, Barbara  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 526  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.36	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.47	4.22	4.32	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.35	4.11	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.42	4.17	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1411	4.75	4.41	4.31	4.35	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.04	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.44	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.26	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.44	4.49	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.65	4.54	4.83	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.58	4.50	4.69	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	47/ 92	4.50	4.34	4.38	4.64	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.32	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.81	4.39	4.75	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 48	4.67	4.64	4.41	4.54	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.71	4.51	4.51	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.54	4.18	4.19	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	26/ 44	4.33	4.37	4.32	4.07	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.67	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.25	4.14	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.67	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.05	4.67	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 2	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 3	Non-major	4
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 0			
				? 0				

Course-Section: EDUC 489 1  
 Title Adv Special Topics:Edu  
 Instructor: Bourne,Barbara  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 527  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.36	4.26	4.26	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.47	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.29	4.09	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.35	4.11	4.23	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.42	4.17	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.19	4.09	4.18	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.42	4.46	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1131/1236	3.00	4.04	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.44	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.26	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	4	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	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	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	3	6	1	7	3.19	1456/1509	3.60	4.41	4.31	4.39	3.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	2	7	4	3	2.90	1483/1509	3.45	4.36	4.26	4.25	2.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	6	6	5	3.68	1227/1459	4.34	4.47	4.22	4.16	3.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	4	3	2	2	5	3.06	1324/1406	3.06	4.29	4.09	4.12	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	1	2	2	10	3.55	1168/1384	4.28	4.35	4.11	4.16	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	0	5	6	6	3.60	1263/1489	4.30	4.42	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	4	0	0	0	16	4.20	1300/1506	4.60	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	4	2	6	8	1	3.00	1392/1463	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	6	1	4	4	5	3.05	1404/1438	3.05	4.42	4.46	4.49	3.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	2	2	2	12	4.00	1345/1421	4.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	2	4	3	6	3.26	1331/1411	3.26	4.41	4.31	4.33	3.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	6	4	1	1	6	2.83	1373/1405	2.83	4.31	4.32	4.33	2.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	6	1	4	2	6	3.05	1123/1236	3.05	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	0	4	2	8	3.30	1108/1260	3.65	4.44	4.14	4.21	3.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	2	7	6	3.68	1077/1255	4.34	4.63	4.33	4.43	3.68
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	2	4	11	4.05	916/1258	4.53	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	5	0	5	3	4	3.06	796/ 873	4.03	4.43	4.03	4.01	3.06
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.54	4.18	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	3	A 13	Required for Majors 18	Graduate 5	Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 17	Non-major 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 601 2  
 Title Human Learning/Cogniti  
 Instructor: Singer,Jonathan  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 529  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1114/1509	3.60	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1086/1509	3.45	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.34	4.47	4.22	4.16	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.28	4.35	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.30	4.42	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.60	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.15	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	746/1260	3.65	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.34	4.63	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.53	4.67	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	4.03	4.43	4.03	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 605 1  
 Title The Adult Learner  
 Instructor: Raudenbush,Lind  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 530  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4									
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.36	4.26	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.47	4.22	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.29	4.09	4.12	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.35	4.11	4.16	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.42	4.17	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.19	4.09	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.42	4.46	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.44	4.14	4.21	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.43	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.01	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 5	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	0	Under-grad 2	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: EDUC 625 1  
 Title Teach Read Writ ELS I  
 Instructor: Shin,Sarah J  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 531  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	279/1509	4.78	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	412/1509	4.61	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	400/1406	4.44	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	269/1384	4.61	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.61
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	660/1438	4.61	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	194/1405	4.89	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	4	4	10	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	344/1260	4.61	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.11	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	3	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	8	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 636 1  
 Title ELS/For Lang Test & Ev  
 Instructor: Nelson,John E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 532  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	210/1509	4.84	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	223/1509	4.79	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	337/1287	4.68	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	173/1459	4.78	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	208/1406	4.68	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	92/1384	4.84	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.84
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	167/1489	4.79	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	339/1411	4.72	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	103/1405	4.94	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	3	0	2	4	3	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	367/1255	4.74	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	312/1258	4.84	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.54	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.37	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.25	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: EDUC 636 1  
 Title ELS/For Lang Test & Ev  
 Instructor: Nelson, John E  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 532  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	7	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						



Course-Section: EDUC 650 1  
 Title Educ In Cultural Persp  
 Instructor: Young,Patricia  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 533  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	0	3	8	4.07	1065/1509	4.07	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	901/1509	4.21	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	5	6	4.07	894/1287	4.07	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	868/1459	4.15	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	761/1406	4.07	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	2	7	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	376/1489	4.57	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	466/1506	4.93	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1060/1463	3.80	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	852/1438	4.46	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	691/1421	4.85	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	902/1411	4.23	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	804/1236	3.85	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	496/1260	4.42	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	519/1255	4.58	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	770/1258	4.33	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 667 1  
 Title Grammar For Amer Engl  
 Instructor: Nelson,John E  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 534  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	175/1509	4.83	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	143/1287	4.88	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	131/1459	4.83	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	132/1384	4.78	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	88/1463	4.88	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.42	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	159/1411	4.88	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	194/1405	4.89	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	4	0	3	1	2	2.70	1185/1236	2.70	4.04	4.00	3.98	2.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	402/1260	4.53	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	402/1255	4.71	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	710/1258	4.41	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.41
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	2	0	3	1	6	3.75	610/ 873	3.75	4.43	4.03	4.01	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.54	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.37	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.25	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: EDUC 667 1  
 Title Grammar For Amer Engl  
 Instructor: Nelson, John E  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 534  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	8	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	8	Major	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 678 1  
 Title Inst Strat/Div Needs  
 Instructor: Berge,Nancy B  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 535  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.47	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	90/1406	4.90	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.35	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	92/1489	4.90	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	219/1438	4.90	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1411	4.90	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	67/1236	4.90	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.44	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.63	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	105/ 873	4.78	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.78
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 681 1  
 Title Surv Of Instr Tech App  
 Instructor: Kellerman,Paul (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 536  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1509	4.93	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	93/1509	4.93	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1406	****	4.29	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	183/1489	4.77	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	545/1463	4.24	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	175/1438	4.84	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1421	4.90	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	267/1411	4.64	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1405	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1236	4.88	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1031/1260	3.55	4.44	4.14	4.21	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	792/1258	4.30	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	366/ 873	4.20	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	10	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 681 1  
 Title Surv Of Instr Tech App  
 Instructor: Ira,Katherine E (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 537  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	127/1509	4.93	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	93/1509	4.93	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	10	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/1406	****	4.29	4.09	4.12	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	183/1489	4.77	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	750/1463	4.24	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.84	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	794/1421	4.90	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	617/1411	4.64	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1405	4.75	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/1236	4.88	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	3	2	4	3.55	1031/1260	3.55	4.44	4.14	4.21	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	792/1258	4.30	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	366/ 873	4.20	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.43	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 10	Major 12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 4	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 688 1  
 Title Methodology Teach ELS  
 Instructor: Nelson,John E  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 538  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	141/1509	4.88	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	175/1287	4.85	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	324/1459	4.63	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	149/1384	4.75	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	145/1489	4.81	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	278/1463	4.56	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	389/1411	4.69	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	273/1405	4.81	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	3	0	3	3	2	3.09	1117/1236	3.09	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	337/1260	4.63	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	278/1255	4.81	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	577/1258	4.56	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	8	5	4.13	400/ 873	4.13	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.54	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.37	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	4.25	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: EDUC 688 1  
 Title Methodology Teach ELS  
 Instructor: Nelson, John E  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 538  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	5	A	11	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	9	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



Course-Section: EDUC 689 1  
 Title Adv Spec Top In Educ  
 Instructor: Raudenbush,Lind (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 539  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.90	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.90	4.36	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.90	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	280/1459	4.49	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	502/1406	4.51	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	807/1384	4.10	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.63	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.22	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.72	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	4.95	4.41	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	4.90	4.31	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	274/1236	4.39	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	4.86	4.44	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	4.81	4.63	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	4.95	4.67	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.14	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	4.60	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.40	4.22	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.11	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.41	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.44	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.65	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.58	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.30	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.04	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 1	Graduate 2	Major 3
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 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 689 1  
 Title Adv Spec Top In Educ  
 Instructor: Sugar, Stephen E (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 540  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.90	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1509	4.90	4.36	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.90	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	280/1459	4.49	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	502/1406	4.51	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	807/1384	4.10	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.63	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	853/1463	4.22	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	800/1438	4.72	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	4.95	4.41	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.90	4.31	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	421/1236	4.39	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	4.86	4.44	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	4.81	4.63	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	4.95	4.67	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.14	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	4.60	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.40	4.22	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.11	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.41	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.44	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.65	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.58	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.30	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.04	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 1	Graduate 2	Major 3
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 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 689 2  
 Title Adv Spec Top In Educ  
 Instructor: Petska,Deborah  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 541  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	351/1509	4.90	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1509	4.90	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	304/1287	4.90	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	877/1459	4.49	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1406	4.51	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	589/1384	4.10	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	376/1489	4.63	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	545/1463	4.22	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	4.72	4.42	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	190/1411	4.95	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1405	4.90	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	421/1236	4.39	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	370/1260	4.86	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	647/1255	4.81	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.95	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	250/ 873	4.14	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.43

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

Course-Section: EDUC 771 1  
 Title Research Designs In Ed  
 Instructor: Olia,Nezhat F (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 542  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1306/1509	3.67	4.36	4.26	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	4.47	4.22	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.67	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	4.35	4.11	4.16	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1462/1463	3.00	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1406/1438	3.00	4.42	4.46	4.49	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1345/1421	3.50	4.83	4.73	4.78	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1277/1411	3.25	4.41	4.31	4.33	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1348/1405	3.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.04	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	982/1260	3.67	4.44	4.14	4.21	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.60	4.16	4.07	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	4.40	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.11	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.25	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.44	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.65	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.58	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.30	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.04	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.81	4.39	4.36	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.64	4.41	4.40	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.71	4.51	4.43	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.54	4.18	4.03	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.37	4.32	4.45	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.16	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	18/ 41	4.00	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.11	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.05	3.69	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.26	5.00

Course-Section: EDUC 771 1  
 Title Research Designs In Ed  
 Instructor: Olia,Nezhat F (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 542  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 771 1  
 Title Research Designs In Ed  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 543  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1306/1509	3.67	4.36	4.26	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	4.47	4.22	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.67	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	4.35	4.11	4.16	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	982/1260	3.67	4.44	4.14	4.21	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.60	4.16	4.07	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	4.40	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.11	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.25	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.44	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.65	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.58	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.30	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.04	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.81	4.39	4.36	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.64	4.41	4.40	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.71	4.51	4.43	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.54	4.18	4.03	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.37	4.32	4.45	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.16	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	18/ 41	4.00	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.11	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.05	3.69	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.26	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	0
?	0		

Course-Section: EDUC 771 1  
 Title Research Designs In Ed  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 544  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1306/1509	3.67	4.36	4.26	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	4.47	4.22	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.67	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	4.35	4.11	4.16	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	941/1506	4.67	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1406/1438	3.00	4.42	4.46	4.49	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1413/1421	3.50	4.83	4.73	4.78	3.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1361/1411	3.25	4.41	4.31	4.33	3.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1348/1405	3.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	982/1260	3.67	4.44	4.14	4.21	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.43	4.03	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	4.60	4.16	4.07	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	4.40	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 184	5.00	5.00	4.48	4.11	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	5.00	4.18	4.25	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.44	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.65	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.58	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.30	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.04	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.81	4.39	4.36	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.64	4.41	4.40	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.71	4.51	4.43	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.54	4.18	4.03	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.37	4.32	4.45	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	5.00	4.26	4.16	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	18/ 41	4.00	4.25	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	5.00	4.31	4.11	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.05	3.69	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.27	4.26	5.00



Course-Section: EDUC 771 1  
 Title Research Designs In Ed  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 544  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1079/1509	4.06	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	774/1509	4.33	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.86	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	367/1459	4.59	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	10	4.28	563/1406	4.28	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	7	4.11	742/1384	4.11	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	175/1489	4.78	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	350/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	467/1463	4.40	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	839/1438	4.47	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	322/1421	4.94	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	592/1411	4.53	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	671/1405	4.47	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	0	2	8	2	3.57	950/1236	3.57	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	265/1260	4.72	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	561/1255	4.53	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	409/1258	4.76	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	1	1	5	6	3.80	585/ 873	3.80	4.43	4.03	4.01	3.80
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.71	4.51	4.43	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	4.25	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	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 1	Under-grad 14 Non-major 18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		

I	0	Other	1
?	0		

Course-Section: EDUC 781 1  
 Title Teacher Leadership  
 Instructor: Schaffer, Eugene  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 546  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1399/1509	4.09	4.41	4.31	4.39	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1259/1509	4.31	4.36	4.26	4.25	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	770/1459	4.37	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1396/1406	3.75	4.29	4.09	4.12	2.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1264/1384	4.30	4.35	4.11	4.16	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1236/1489	4.39	4.42	4.17	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1476/1506	4.31	4.75	4.67	4.71	3.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1314/1463	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1315/1438	4.42	4.42	4.46	4.49	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421	4.87	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1051/1411	4.46	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1191/1405	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.33	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1078/1236	3.81	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	746/1260	4.42	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	4.71	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258	4.82	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	333/ 873	4.42	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 781 2  
 Title Teacher Leadership  
 Instructor: Clements,Jennif  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 547  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	434/1509	4.09	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	223/1509	4.31	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	164/1459	4.37	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	12	4.64	238/1406	3.75	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	89/1384	4.30	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	73/1489	4.39	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	832/1506	4.31	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	381/1463	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	291/1438	4.42	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	665/1421	4.87	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	201/1411	4.46	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	228/1405	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	229/1236	3.81	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	223/1260	4.42	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	526/1255	4.71	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	468/1258	4.82	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	114/ 873	4.42	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 5 Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9 Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 781 3  
 Title Teacher Leadership  
 Instructor: Schaffer, Eugene  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 548  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	3	7	4.13	1010/1509	4.09	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	699/1509	4.31	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	938/1459	4.37	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	551/1406	3.75	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	182/1384	4.30	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	376/1489	4.39	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1070/1506	4.31	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	511/1463	4.05	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	588/1438	4.42	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1421	4.87	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	580/1411	4.46	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	683/1405	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	930/1236	3.81	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	11	4.47	451/1260	4.42	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	287/1255	4.71	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1258	4.82	4.67	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	328/ 873	4.42	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.27
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.44	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.65	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.58	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.34	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.38	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.81	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.64	4.41	4.40	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.54	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.37	4.32	4.45	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 782 1  
 Title Issues In ECE  
 Instructor: Small,Sue E  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 549  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1406	4.83	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	276/1489	4.67	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.42	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	4.04	4.00	3.98	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	738/ 873	3.40	4.43	4.03	4.01	3.40
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	61/ 89	4.33	4.44	4.49	4.39	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.65	4.54	4.52	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.58	4.50	4.48	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	81/ 92	3.67	4.34	4.38	4.30	3.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 93	4.67	4.38	4.06	4.04	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.81	4.39	4.36	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 48	4.67	4.64	4.41	4.40	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.71	4.51	4.43	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47	4.67	4.54	4.18	4.03	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	20/ 44	4.50	4.37	4.32	4.45	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 2	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	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0				
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0				
				I 0	Other 0			
				? 0				

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 1  
 Title Practicum In Ed Sec 7-  
 Instructor: Murphy, Joyce A  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 550  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	505/1509	4.59	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	683/1509	4.41	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	739/1287	4.30	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	335/1459	4.61	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	12	4.44	400/1406	4.44	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	541/1489	4.44	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	235/1463	4.63	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.63
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1236	****	4.04	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	294/1260	4.69	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	143/1255	4.94	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	165/1258	4.94	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	274/ 873	4.38	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 184	****	4.60	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.40	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	5.00	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	5.00	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	5.00	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	57/ 89	4.56	4.44	4.49	4.39	4.56
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	32/ 92	4.83	4.65	4.54	4.52	4.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	48/ 90	4.61	4.58	4.50	4.48	4.61
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	53/ 92	4.44	4.34	4.38	4.30	4.44
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	31/ 93	4.56	4.38	4.06	4.04	4.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	6	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						



Course-Section: EDUC 791S 1  
 Title Prac In Ed Tesol K-12  
 Instructor: Wilson, Margaret  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 551  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	587/1406	4.25	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1101/1463	3.75	4.19	4.09	4.15	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	885/1411	4.25	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	51/ 89	4.67	4.44	4.49	4.39	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.65	4.54	4.52	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.58	4.50	4.48	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	62/ 92	4.33	4.34	4.38	4.30	4.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 93	4.67	4.38	4.06	4.04	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.81	4.39	4.36	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.64	4.41	4.40	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.71	4.51	4.43	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.54	4.18	4.03	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.37	4.32	4.45	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792 1  
 Title ISD Internship  
 Instructor: Frick, Jerri L.  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 552  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	598/1509	4.75	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	223/1509	4.89	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1287	4.94	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	77/1459	4.96	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	223/1406	4.83	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	149/1384	4.88	4.35	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	167/1489	4.89	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	466/1506	4.96	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	438/1463	4.71	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	291/1438	4.93	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	429/1421	4.96	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	190/1411	4.93	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	333/1405	4.88	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	147/1236	4.86	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	272/1260	4.86	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	246/1255	4.93	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	386/1258	4.89	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	101/ 873	4.89	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.79
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	5.00	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.25	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	5.00	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.27	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792 2  
 Title ISD Internship  
 Instructor: Frick, Jerri L.  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 553  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.75	4.41	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.89	4.36	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	4.94	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.96	4.47	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.83	4.29	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.88	4.35	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.89	4.42	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.96	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.71	4.19	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.93	4.42	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.96	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.93	4.41	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.88	4.31	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	4.86	4.04	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.86	4.44	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.93	4.63	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.89	4.67	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	4.89	4.43	4.03	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 1  
 Title Int In Edu Tesol K-12  
 Instructor: Stein,Hollis G  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 554  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1509	4.80	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.74	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	587/1406	4.25	4.29	4.09	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.35	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.42	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.75	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	****	4.04	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.44	4.14	4.21	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	505/1255	4.60	4.63	4.33	4.43	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.43	4.03	4.01	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.44	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.65	4.54	4.52	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.58	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 92	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.30	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 93	5.00	4.38	4.06	4.04	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.81	4.39	4.36	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.64	4.41	4.40	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.71	4.51	4.43	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	24/ 47	4.50	4.54	4.18	4.03	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.37	4.32	4.45	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 794 2  
 Title ISD Project Seminar  
 Instructor: Kinerney, Donna  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 555  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.41	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	699/1509	4.40	4.36	4.26	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.74	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	4.29	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1192/1384	3.50	4.35	4.11	4.16	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	597/1489	4.40	4.42	4.17	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.42	4.46	4.49	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	936/1411	4.20	4.41	4.31	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.31	4.32	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1213/1236	2.25	4.04	4.00	3.98	2.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	908/1260	3.80	4.44	4.14	4.21	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1037/1255	3.80	4.63	4.33	4.43	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.67	4.38	4.50	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	801/ 873	3.00	4.43	4.03	4.01	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	63/ 89	4.20	4.44	4.49	4.39	4.20
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	36/ 92	4.80	4.65	4.54	4.52	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	64/ 90	4.20	4.58	4.50	4.48	4.20
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	64/ 92	4.20	4.34	4.38	4.30	4.20
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	30/ 93	4.60	4.38	4.06	4.04	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 795 2  
 Title Sem Study Teaching  
 Instructor: Nwankwo,Adam F  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 556  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	5	8	1	3.16	1463/1509	3.08	4.41	4.31	4.39	3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	6	4	4	3.32	1423/1509	3.16	4.36	4.26	4.25	3.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1287	****	4.74	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	5	4	3	4	3.24	1390/1459	3.62	4.47	4.22	4.16	3.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	2	3	7	3.37	1249/1406	4.18	4.29	4.09	4.12	3.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	3	5	4	3.21	1294/1384	4.11	4.35	4.11	4.16	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	6	2	2	2	5	2.88	1427/1489	2.94	4.42	4.17	4.14	2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	1	4.05	1364/1506	4.05	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	7	4	4	1	2.82	1420/1463	3.41	4.19	4.09	4.15	2.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	5	1	4	4	3.19	1396/1438	2.59	4.42	4.46	4.49	3.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	1269/1421	4.66	4.83	4.73	4.78	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	5	4	3	2	3.00	1361/1411	3.00	4.41	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	5	5	1	4	3.13	1338/1405	3.06	4.31	4.32	4.33	3.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	4	1	7	1	1	2.57	1194/1236	3.29	4.04	4.00	3.98	2.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	4	4	4	3.29	1110/1260	4.15	4.44	4.14	4.21	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1108/1255	3.29	4.63	4.33	4.43	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	3	5	3	5	3.47	1151/1258	4.24	4.67	4.38	4.50	3.47
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	5	2	4	1	3.08	793/ 873	3.08	4.43	4.03	4.01	3.08
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	1	2	5	6	4	3.56	81/ 89	3.28	4.44	4.49	4.39	3.56
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	2	2	7	6	3.83	87/ 92	3.42	4.65	4.54	4.52	3.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	6	0	6	6	3.67	84/ 90	3.33	4.58	4.50	4.48	3.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	6	5	3	3.33	86/ 92	3.17	4.34	4.38	4.30	3.33
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	7	3	1	4	3	2.61	88/ 93	2.81	4.38	4.06	4.04	2.61

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8	Graduate	11
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	Major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0	General	0
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Under-grad	9
			P 0	Non-major	20
			I 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			? 1	Electives	0
				Other	0

Course-Section: EDUC 795 3  
 Title Sem Study Teaching  
 Instructor: Nwankwo,Adam F  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 557  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1473/1509	3.08	4.41	4.31	4.39	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1463/1509	3.16	4.36	4.26	4.25	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	979/1459	3.62	4.47	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	4.18	4.29	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	4.11	4.35	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1489	2.94	4.42	4.17	4.14	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	3.41	4.19	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1432/1438	2.59	4.42	4.46	4.49	2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.66	4.83	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1361/1411	3.00	4.41	4.31	4.33	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1348/1405	3.06	4.31	4.32	4.33	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	3.29	4.04	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.15	4.44	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.29	4.63	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	4.24	4.67	4.38	4.50	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.28	4.44	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	91/ 92	3.42	4.65	4.54	4.52	3.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	89/ 90	3.33	4.58	4.50	4.48	3.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92	3.17	4.34	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	79/ 93	2.81	4.38	4.06	4.04	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	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	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	0				
				?	0						