

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: LENNON, NICHOLA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 576
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	5	6	3	3.73	1453/1670	3.73	4.48	4.31	4.32	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1419/1666	3.73	4.45	4.27	4.27	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	868/1406	4.27	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	4	4	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.51	4.24	4.29	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	4.14	4.07	4.00	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	3	5	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.42	4.12	4.11	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1235/1650	3.93	4.43	4.22	4.20	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.93	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1072/1626	3.97	4.27	4.11	4.06	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	946/1559	4.45	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	1279/1560	4.52	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	646/1549	4.58	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	949/1546	4.09	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	794/1323	3.71	4.12	4.00	4.08	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	400/1378	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.26	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	194/ 904	4.63	4.34	4.03	4.01	4.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: LENNON, NICHOLA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 576
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 577
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	5	6	3	3.73	1453/1670	3.73	4.48	4.31	4.32	3.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1419/1666	3.73	4.45	4.27	4.27	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	868/1406	4.27	4.50	4.32	4.39	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	4	4	3.67	1380/1615	3.67	4.51	4.24	4.29	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1108/1566	3.80	4.14	4.07	4.00	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	3	5	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.42	4.12	4.11	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1235/1650	3.93	4.43	4.22	4.20	3.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.93	4.83	4.67	4.64	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	953/1626	3.97	4.27	4.11	4.06	3.97
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	996/1559	4.45	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1188/1560	4.52	4.86	4.72	4.73	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	537/1549	4.58	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1244/1546	4.09	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	1040/1323	3.71	4.12	4.00	4.08	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	400/1378	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.25	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.26	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	194/ 904	4.63	4.34	4.03	4.01	4.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	****	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 577
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: GAURIN, ADELL A
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 578
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	737/1670	4.12	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1048/1666	4.31	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	953/1615	4.26	4.51	4.24	4.18	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1010/1566	3.92	4.14	4.07	4.04	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	688/1528	4.17	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	395/1650	4.28	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1477/1667	4.22	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	403/1626	4.21	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	1062/1559	4.22	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	634/1549	4.36	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	782/1546	4.10	4.43	4.32	4.24	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	481/1323	3.78	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	541/1384	4.48	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	4.72	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1378	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	179/ 904	4.17	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.67	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	3.99	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.30	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.53	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	3.68	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	3.76	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	24/ 41	4.78	4.76	4.50	4.44	4.82	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	30/ 38	4.05	4.26	4.19	3.96	3.73	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	5	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	19/ 38	4.63	4.44	4.62	4.68	4.83	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	23/ 39	4.04	4.33	4.27	4.38	4.29	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	4	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	20/ 31	4.14	4.41	4.47	4.51	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: DANNA, S
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 579
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1425/1670	4.12	4.48	4.31	4.24	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	751/1666	4.31	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	775/1615	4.26	4.51	4.24	4.18	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	1	8	3.93	978/1566	3.92	4.14	4.07	4.04	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	859/1528	4.17	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1249/1650	4.28	4.43	4.22	4.12	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1295/1667	4.22	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	5	4	3.93	1089/1626	4.21	4.27	4.11	4.06	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	5	5	4.08	1260/1559	4.22	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	948/1560	4.88	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	0	8	4.17	1053/1549	4.36	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	0	1	7	3.75	1293/1546	4.10	4.43	4.32	4.24	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	6	1	1	3.22	1135/1323	3.78	4.12	4.00	3.99	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	403/1384	4.48	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	672/1378	4.72	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	531/1378	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	671/ 904	4.17	4.34	4.03	4.03	3.67
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	28/ 41	4.78	4.76	4.50	4.44	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	22/ 38	4.05	4.26	4.19	3.96	4.38
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	29/ 38	4.63	4.44	4.62	4.68	4.43
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	3	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	31/ 39	4.04	4.33	4.27	4.38	3.80
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	4	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	21/ 31	4.14	4.41	4.47	4.51	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	2.63	****

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: DANNA, S
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 579
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 580
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1150/1670	4.39	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	719/1666	4.59	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	7	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1406	4.38	4.50	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	910/1615	4.58	4.51	4.24	4.18	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	851/1566	4.33	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	733/1528	4.54	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1067/1650	4.49	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1022/1667	4.49	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	953/1626	4.29	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	1052/1559	4.65	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	948/1560	4.84	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	366/1549	4.84	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	987/1546	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.24	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	857/1323	4.43	4.12	4.00	3.99	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	390/1384	4.72	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1378	4.73	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	4.94	4.75	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	214/ 904	4.66	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.57

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 581
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	10	4.67	479/1670	4.39	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	333/1666	4.59	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	751/1406	4.38	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	123/1615	4.58	4.51	4.24	4.18	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	295/1566	4.33	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	141/1528	4.54	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	187/1650	4.49	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.87
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	1334/1667	4.49	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	339/1626	4.29	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	221/1559	4.65	4.59	4.46	4.40	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	477/1560	4.84	4.86	4.72	4.67	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	161/1549	4.84	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	299/1546	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.24	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1323	4.43	4.12	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1384	4.72	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	400/1378	4.73	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	312/1378	4.94	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	146/ 904	4.66	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 15	Non-major 15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 313 0101
 Title PEER ASSISTED LRNING I
 Instructor: DAVIS, THERESA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 582
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.51	4.24	4.18	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1626	4.75	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	366/1549	4.75	4.53	4.31	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 314 0101
 Title PEER ASSISTED LRNING I
 Instructor: DAVIS, THERESA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 583
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 314 0101
 Title PEER ASSISTED LRNING I
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 584
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.12	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.12	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.03	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

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

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101
 Title TUTORING AND LITERACY
 Instructor: TAYLOR, JOBY B (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 585
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101
 Title TUTORING AND LITERACY
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 586
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	300/1670	4.80	4.48	4.31	4.24	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.18	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.14	4.07	4.04	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.42	4.12	4.07	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.50	4.10	4.12	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	797/1378	4.33	4.68	4.29	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.33	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101
 Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO
 Instructor: DANNA, S
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 587
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.14	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.42	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.80	4.83	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1626	4.60	4.27	4.11	4.06	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	626/1323	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.99	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.34	4.03	4.03	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0101
 Title READ CONTNT AREA I
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 588
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	3	5	6	3.72	1458/1670	3.72	4.48	4.31	4.45	3.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	1003/1666	4.22	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	898/1615	4.24	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	1078/1566	3.83	4.14	4.07	4.17	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	832/1528	4.11	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	1067/1650	4.11	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	921/1626	4.06	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	607/1559	4.71	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	1042/1560	4.71	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	876/1549	4.35	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	1048/1546	4.18	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	315/1323	4.53	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	400/1378	4.75	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1378	4.82	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0101
 Title READ CONTNT AREA I
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 588
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0101
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 589
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	15	0	1	0	1	0	8	4.40	809/1670	4.51	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	490/1666	4.61	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1406	4.60	4.50	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	687/1615	4.47	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	1181/1566	3.85	4.14	4.07	4.17	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	662/1528	4.38	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	327/1650	4.31	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1667	4.85	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	728/1626	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	4.78	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.76	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.76	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	822/1546	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	288/1323	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1378	4.86	4.68	4.29	4.55	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/1378	4.86	4.75	4.31	4.60	****
4. Were special techniques successful	19	1	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	****/ 904	4.83	4.34	4.03	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors		0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		9				
				?	0							

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0201
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 590
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	9	4.62	544/1670	4.51	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	477/1666	4.61	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	520/1615	4.47	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	851/1566	3.85	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	476/1528	4.38	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	1249/1650	4.31	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.85	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	403/1626	4.38	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	834/1559	4.78	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1090/1560	4.76	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	488/1549	4.76	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	520/1546	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	0	6	2	3.89	834/1323	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	295/1378	4.86	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/ 904	4.83	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.83

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 416 0101
 Title MATERIALS TCH READ
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 591
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1116/1670	4.14	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	724/1615	4.38	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	520/1566	4.38	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1347/1626	3.60	4.27	4.11	4.28	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	725/1560	4.86	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	631/1546	4.57	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	899/1378	4.20	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	405/ 904	4.20	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	8
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 417 0101
 Title PROC & ACQUIS READ
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 592
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.14	4.07	4.17	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.42	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 418 0101
 Title INSTRUCTION OF READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 593
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1008/1650	4.17	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	960/1323	3.67	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0101
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 594
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	665/1670	4.15	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	622/1666	3.67	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.29	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	851/1566	3.42	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	899/1528	3.92	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1404/1650	3.75	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.08	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	4.42	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549	4.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	4.42	4.43	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1040/1323	3.55	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	820/1384	4.20	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	400/1378	4.78	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	4.90	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.30	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.36	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.44	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.33	4.27	4.02	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.41	4.47	4.49	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0201
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 595
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1414/1670	4.15	4.48	4.31	4.45	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	2.83	1633/1666	3.67	4.45	4.27	4.35	2.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1275/1406	3.50	4.50	4.32	4.48	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1276/1615	4.29	4.51	4.24	4.37	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1520/1566	3.42	4.14	4.07	4.17	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1097/1528	3.92	4.42	4.12	4.26	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1314/1650	3.75	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	805/1667	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1384/1626	4.08	4.27	4.11	4.28	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1382/1559	4.42	4.59	4.46	4.58	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	0	1	3.33	1443/1549	4.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1260/1546	4.42	4.43	4.32	4.43	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	990/1323	3.55	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	541/1384	4.20	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.78	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.90	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	202/ 904	4.30	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.98	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	5.00	4.44	4.62	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	5.00	4.33	4.27	4.02	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	5.00	4.41	4.47	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				

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

Course-Section: EDUC 420 0101
 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 596
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	4.25	996/1670	4.25	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1533/1566	2.67	4.14	4.07	4.17	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1447/1528	3.00	4.42	4.12	4.26	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1580/1650	3.00	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1491/1626	3.25	4.27	4.11	4.28	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1193/1378	3.50	4.68	4.29	4.55	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	867/1378	4.25	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 421 0101
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SC
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 597
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	11	4.92	185/1670	4.92	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1615	4.92	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	109/1528	4.92	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	231/1626	4.73	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1378	4.82	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378	4.91	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	126/ 904	4.82	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.82

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	11				
				? 0						

Course-Section: EDUC 422 0101
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES: ELEM S
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 598
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	0	2	9	4.31	943/1670	4.31	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	582/1666	4.54	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	176/1615	4.91	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	510/1566	4.38	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	398/1528	4.54	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	417/1650	4.62	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1271/1667	4.38	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	167/1626	4.80	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	857/1323	3.86	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	498/1384	4.44	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	564/1378	4.56	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	621/1378	4.56	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.60	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.56	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	12	
?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 439 0101
 Title OBSERVATION & ASSESSME
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 599
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1114/1666	4.13	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	477/1615	4.57	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	643/1566	4.25	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1359/1650	3.75	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	854/1626	4.14	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	570/1546	4.63	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	288/1323	4.57	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 38	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.36	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.44	4.62	4.58	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.33	4.27	4.02	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.41	4.47	4.49	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		0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
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		3				
				?	0							

Course-Section: EDUC 441 0101
 Title MATERIALS FOR EARLY LI
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 600
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	544/1670	4.62	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	138/1666	4.92	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	374/1566	4.54	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	277/1528	4.69	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	499/1626	4.44	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	829/1560	4.82	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	525/1549	4.64	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	667/1546	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1384	4.86	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	128/ 904	4.80	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 442 0101
 Title PROCESS SEM ECE - MEDI
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 601
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	295/1566	4.67	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	346/1528	4.60	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	531/1626	4.43	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.43

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1323	4.75	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.75

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.22	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
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	3				
				? 0						

Course-Section: EDUC 443 0101
 Title PROCESS SEM: ECE-M/S I
 Instructor: BELL, DEBORAH A
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 602
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	8	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	465/1666	4.63	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1235/1406	3.67	4.50	4.32	4.48	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1447/1566	3.14	4.14	4.07	4.17	3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	307/1650	4.71	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	1023/1560	4.71	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	631/1546	4.57	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	1259/1323	2.67	4.12	4.00	4.10	2.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.50	4.10	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	4.34	4.03	4.22	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.26	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.30	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 447 0101
 Title TCHNG RDG & WRITING EC
 Instructor: ROBERTS, HILARY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 603
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	253/1670	4.86	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1666	4.86	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.48	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	326/1615	4.71	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	159/1566	4.86	4.14	4.07	4.17	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	192/1528	4.79	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	255/1626	4.69	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	469/1559	4.79	4.59	4.46	4.58	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	323/1549	4.79	4.53	4.31	4.43	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	185/1546	4.93	4.43	4.32	4.43	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	612/1323	4.17	4.12	4.00	4.10	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	226/ 904	4.55	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.55	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.98	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	19/ 38	4.50	4.26	4.19	4.36	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	25/ 39	4.00	4.33	4.27	4.02	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: EDUC 453 0101
 Title ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 604
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	849/1670	4.38	4.48	4.31	4.45	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.50	4.32	4.48	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.51	4.24	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	4.14	4.07	4.17	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.43	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1559	****	4.59	4.46	4.58	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1560	****	4.86	4.72	4.80	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1549	****	4.53	4.31	4.43	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1546	****	4.43	4.32	4.43	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.34	4.03	4.22	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	63/ 87	4.57	4.68	4.65	4.80	4.57
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	53/ 79	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.60	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.61	4.57	4.56	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	61/ 79	4.13	4.47	4.45	4.53	4.13
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	35/ 80	4.13	4.40	3.97	3.67	4.13
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.98	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	16/ 38	4.67	4.26	4.19	4.36	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	32/ 38	4.33	4.44	4.62	4.58	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	14/ 39	4.67	4.33	4.27	4.02	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	14/ 31	4.80	4.41	4.47	4.49	4.80

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 457 0101
 Title SCNDRY INTRNSHP SEMINA
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 605
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	2	2	3.29	1593/1670	3.29	4.48	4.31	4.45	3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	1	1	3.14	1591/1666	3.14	4.45	4.27	4.35	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1275/1406	3.50	4.50	4.32	4.48	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1448/1615	3.50	4.51	4.24	4.37	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1285/1566	3.50	4.14	4.07	4.17	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.42	4.12	4.26	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1534/1650	3.29	4.43	4.22	4.28	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	768/1667	4.86	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.27	4.11	4.28	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	1418/1559	3.71	4.59	4.46	4.58	3.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	777/1560	4.83	4.86	4.72	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1270/1549	3.83	4.53	4.31	4.43	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1361/1546	3.57	4.43	4.32	4.43	3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	960/1323	3.67	4.12	4.00	4.10	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1103/1384	3.50	4.50	4.10	4.32	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	590/1378	4.60	4.75	4.31	4.60	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	4.34	4.03	4.22	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	61/ 87	4.67	4.68	4.65	4.80	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	76/ 79	3.33	4.43	4.64	4.60	3.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	58/ 75	4.00	4.61	4.57	4.56	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	62/ 79	4.00	4.47	4.45	4.53	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	55/ 80	3.50	4.40	3.97	3.67	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 41	4.75	4.76	4.50	4.98	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	34/ 38	2.75	4.26	4.19	4.36	2.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	38/ 38	3.00	4.44	4.62	4.58	3.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	32/ 39	3.75	4.33	4.27	4.02	3.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	31/ 31	3.25	4.41	4.47	4.49	3.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0101
 Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 606
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	557/1670	4.60	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1199/1559	4.20	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1285/1549	3.80	4.53	4.31	4.37	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1273/1546	3.80	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	990/1323	3.60	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1323/1384	2.67	4.50	4.10	4.21	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1247/1378	3.33	4.68	4.29	4.42	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1147/1378	3.67	4.75	4.31	4.51	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 2	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 6	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 607
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	4.83	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	3.96	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.88	4.42	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	4.83	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	4.40	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	4.70	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	4.80	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	4.60	4.53	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.40	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	4.13	4.12	4.00	4.03	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.17	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.21	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.96	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.46	4.34	4.03	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 608
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	5.00	1/1670	4.83	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	3.96	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.88	4.42	4.12	4.33	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	4.83	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.40	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.17	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.21	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.96	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.46	4.34	4.03	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 609
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	5.00	1/1670	4.83	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	851/1566	3.96	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1528	4.88	4.42	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1650	4.83	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	953/1626	4.40	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	820/1384	4.17	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	970/1378	4.21	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	4.96	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	820/ 904	3.46	4.34	4.03	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	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0201
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV
 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 610
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	902/1670	4.83	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1078/1566	3.96	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	421/1528	4.88	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	806/1650	4.83	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	324/1626	4.40	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1022/1559	4.70	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1163/1560	4.80	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1027/1549	4.60	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	849/1546	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1125/1323	4.13	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	324/1384	4.17	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.21	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.96	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	123/ 904	3.46	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0201
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV
 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 610
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	0	Non-major	6
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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 602T 8010
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV
 Instructor: HODELL, CHARLES
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 611
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.14	4.07	4.20	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	266/1549	4.83	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	310/1546	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	273/1323	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	202/ 904	4.60	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.60
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 603 8010
 Title INSTR SYS DEV II
 Instructor: PETSKA, DEBORAH
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 612
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1666	4.86	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	159/1566	4.86	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.42	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	248/1549	4.86	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	144/1323	4.83	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	120/ 904	4.86	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.68	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	53/ 79	4.50	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.61	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.40	3.97	4.32	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Course-Section: EDUC 603 8010
 Title INSTR SYS DEV II
 Instructor: PETSKA, DEBORAH
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 612
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101
 Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 613
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	0	1	0	4	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1070/1666	4.17	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1325/1406	3.25	4.50	4.32	4.36	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	734/1566	4.17	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	1202/1528	3.67	4.42	4.12	4.33	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	805/1667	4.83	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1438/1626	3.40	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1218/1559	4.17	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1248/1560	4.50	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1053/1549	4.17	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1517/1546	2.67	4.43	4.32	4.40	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 3	Required for Majors	0	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	5	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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	6				
				? 0						

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101
 Title INSTRUCT READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 614
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.14	4.07	4.20	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.40	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.21	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.34	4.03	4.04	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	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	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 615
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	964/1670	4.29	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	529/1666	4.57	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1275/1406	3.50	4.50	4.32	4.36	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	379/1615	4.67	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	470/1566	4.43	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	867/1650	4.29	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1347/1626	3.60	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1199/1559	4.20	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1427/1560	4.20	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1285/1549	3.80	4.53	4.31	4.37	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1411/1546	3.40	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	871/1323	3.83	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	953/1384	3.86	4.50	4.10	4.21	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	915/1378	4.17	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	698/ 904	3.60	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 622 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 616
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	8	4.45	737/1670	4.45	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	943/1666	4.27	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1010/1566	3.91	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	847/1528	4.09	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	645/1650	4.45	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	675/1667	4.91	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1323	****	4.12	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	579/1384	4.36	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1378	4.91	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	560/1378	4.64	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	345/ 904	4.30	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.30
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 625 0101
 Title TEACH READ WRIT ESL I
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 617
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	7	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1666	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	159/1566	4.86	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	147/1528	4.86	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	307/1650	4.71	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	970/1667	4.71	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	809/1559	4.57	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	822/1546	4.43	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	936/1323	3.71	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	285/1384	4.71	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	7
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.	6	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	7				
				? 1						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 618
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	13	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	318/1406	4.75	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	240/1528	4.73	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	111/1650	4.94	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	339/1626	4.58	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	521/1559	4.75	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	333/1546	4.81	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	285/1378	4.87	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	197/1378	4.93	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	367/ 904	4.27	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.27

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 619
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	466/1670	4.68	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	833/1666	4.36	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	401/1615	4.64	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	3	14	4.08	802/1566	4.08	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	560/1528	4.40	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	17	4.52	541/1650	4.52	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	730/1667	4.88	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	531/1626	4.42	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	871/1559	4.52	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	699/1560	4.87	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	722/1549	4.48	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	532/1546	4.65	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	5	6	9	4.20	590/1323	4.20	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	200/1384	4.84	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	146/1378	4.95	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	128/ 904	4.80	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 12 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13 Non-major 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 21	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 655 0101
 Title TCH READ WRIT ESL II
 Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 620
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	224/1670	4.88	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	198/1666	4.88	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	281/1615	4.76	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	79/1566	4.94	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	73/1528	4.94	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	263/1650	4.76	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	712/1667	4.88	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	167/1626	4.80	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	141/1549	4.93	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1546	4.87	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.87
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	403/1323	4.43	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	323/1378	4.87	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	186/ 904	4.64	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 7 Major 12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	14	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	1070/1666	4.17	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	6	5	3.65	1210/1566	3.65	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	1	12	4.35	611/1528	4.35	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	2	4	8	3.78	1347/1650	3.78	4.43	4.22	4.30	3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	712/1667	4.89	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	659/1626	4.31	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	419/1559	4.81	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	879/1546	4.38	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	1	11	4.47	476/1384	4.47	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	919/1378	4.13	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	1	10	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	279/ 904	4.43	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		18				

Course-Section: EDUC 665 0101
 Title CREATIVE MEDIA-ECE
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 622
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	706/1566	4.20	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	435/1559	4.80	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.80	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546	4.80	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	273/1323	4.60	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 623
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	4.50	665/1670	4.42	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	552/1615	4.36	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	389/1566	3.97	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.56	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	570/1650	4.31	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	953/1626	3.94	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1461/1559	4.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	4.88	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1389/1549	3.63	4.53	4.31	4.37	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1139/1546	4.06	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1323	3.50	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	820/1384	4.22	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.83	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	4.64	4.34	4.03	4.04	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	34/ 41	4.00	4.76	4.50	4.65	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	32/ 38	3.50	4.26	4.19	4.58	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	33/ 38	4.00	4.44	4.62	4.65	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	25/ 39	4.00	4.33	4.27	4.59	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 31	4.00	4.41	4.47	4.59	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0201
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 624
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	902/1670	4.42	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1199/1666	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	910/1615	4.36	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	1322/1566	3.97	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	330/1528	4.56	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1067/1650	4.31	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1667	4.75	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1152/1626	3.94	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	896/1559	4.00	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	948/1560	4.88	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1308/1549	3.63	4.53	4.31	4.37	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1087/1546	4.06	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1179/1323	3.50	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	498/1384	4.22	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	481/1378	4.83	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	813/1378	4.67	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	356/ 904	4.64	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 671 8010
 Title PRIN OF TRNG AND DEV
 Instructor: STORY, VIRGINIA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 625
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	557/1670	4.60	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	291/1666	4.78	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	589/1566	4.30	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	202/1528	4.78	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	971/1559	4.44	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	762/1549	4.44	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	655/1546	4.56	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	264/1378	4.89	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	222/ 904	4.56	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.68	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	44/ 79	4.80	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.61	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.47	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.40	3.97	4.32	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4	Major 7
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 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	9	
?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 626
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	3	8	4.20	1060/1670	3.95	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1161/1666	3.93	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	7	4.07	1050/1615	4.28	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	632/1566	4.08	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	398/1528	4.49	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	1	9	4.27	891/1650	4.23	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	472/1667	4.72	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	4	2	5	3.92	1106/1626	3.77	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	846/1559	4.16	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1560	4.72	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	525/1549	4.32	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	557/1546	4.21	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	374/1323	4.28	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	541/1384	3.70	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	495/1378	4.32	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	590/1378	4.38	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	2	1	2	2	7	3.79	614/ 904	3.89	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.79
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	15
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0						
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	9	F	0						
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0201
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS
 Instructor: DANNA, S
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 627
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	2	1	1	5	3.70	1470/1670	3.95	4.48	4.31	4.46	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1383/1666	3.93	4.45	4.27	4.34	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1314/1406	3.33	4.50	4.32	4.36	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	552/1615	4.28	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1010/1566	4.08	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	504/1528	4.49	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	973/1650	4.23	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1157/1667	4.72	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1335/1626	3.77	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1403/1559	4.16	4.59	4.46	4.49	3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	1294/1560	4.72	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1146/1549	4.32	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1285/1546	4.21	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	648/1323	4.28	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1260/1384	3.70	4.50	4.10	4.21	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	970/1378	4.32	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	915/1378	4.38	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	461/ 904	3.89	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	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	7	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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	9				
				? 0						

Course-Section: EDUC 679 0101
 Title OBSERVATION & ASSESSME
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 628
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	224/1615	4.83	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	170/1566	4.83	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.42	4.12	4.33	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1626	4.20	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	520/1546	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	221/1384	4.80	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	128/ 904	4.80	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.80
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 681 8010
 Title SURV OF INSTR TECH APP
 Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 629
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	479/1670	4.67	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	290/1615	4.75	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	560/1528	4.40	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	831/1626	4.17	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	900/1549	4.33	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	715/1546	4.50	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	235/1323	4.67	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	740/1384	4.17	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 904	****	4.34	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	3.38	4.19	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101
 Title METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL
 Instructor: LINVILLE, HEATH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 630
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1060/1670	4.20	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1037/1666	4.20	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1359/1650	3.75	4.43	4.22	4.30	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1347/1626	3.60	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	772/1559	4.60	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1027/1549	4.20	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1293/1546	3.75	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 771 0101
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED
 Instructor: OLIA, NEZHAT
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 631
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1216/1670	3.47	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1479/1666	3.33	4.45	4.27	4.34	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1206/1406	3.75	4.50	4.32	4.36	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1294/1615	3.40	4.51	4.24	4.33	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	706/1566	3.48	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	899/1528	3.53	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	973/1650	3.69	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	861/1667	4.78	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1254/1626	3.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	1199/1559	3.69	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1326/1560	4.32	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1027/1549	3.39	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1354/1546	3.06	4.43	4.32	4.40	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	590/1323	3.38	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	975/1384	3.40	4.50	4.10	4.21	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	525/1378	4.01	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1165/1378	3.56	4.75	4.31	4.51	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	820/ 904	3.36	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	7	4	1	2.94	1629/1670	3.47	4.48	4.31	4.46	2.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	3	7	1	3.06	1600/1666	3.33	4.45	4.27	4.34	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1406	3.75	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	6	3	2	3.00	1565/1615	3.40	4.51	4.24	4.33	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	4	3	6	0	2.75	1527/1566	3.48	4.14	4.07	4.20	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	7	5	1	3.06	1443/1528	3.53	4.42	4.12	4.33	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	7	1	3.18	1557/1650	3.69	4.43	4.22	4.30	3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	909/1667	4.78	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	0	7	3	0	2.92	1558/1626	3.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	2.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	5	7	1	3.19	1507/1559	3.69	4.59	4.46	4.49	3.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	1416/1560	4.32	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	3	4	4	1	2.59	1522/1549	3.39	4.53	4.31	4.37	2.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	5	2	2	2.53	1522/1546	3.06	4.43	4.32	4.40	2.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	4	0	2	2	1	2.56	1266/1323	3.38	4.12	4.00	4.03	2.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	2	3	3.00	1260/1384	3.40	4.50	4.10	4.21	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	1	4	4	5	3.41	1224/1378	4.01	4.68	4.29	4.42	3.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	1184/1378	3.56	4.75	4.31	4.51	3.53
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	643/ 904	3.36	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.73
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 11
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Non-major 17
				P 0	
				I 0	
				Other 15	
				? 1	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 781 8720
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 633
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	2	8	4.29	964/1670	4.29	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	751/1666	4.43	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	520/1615	4.54	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	510/1566	4.38	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	679/1528	4.29	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	782/1650	4.36	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	786/1667	4.85	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	503/1559	4.77	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	549/1549	4.62	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	482/1546	4.69	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	864/1323	3.85	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	235/1384	4.79	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	368/1378	4.79	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	333/1378	4.86	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	210/ 904	4.58	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 781S 2302
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 634
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	10	4.71	414/1670	4.71	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	138/1666	4.93	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	240/1406	4.83	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	141/1615	4.93	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	309/1566	4.64	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	97/1528	4.93	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.43	4.22	4.30	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	885/1667	4.79	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	255/1626	4.70	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	355/1559	4.86	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	185/1546	4.93	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	481/1323	4.33	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.50	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	198/ 904	4.62	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.62
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	3.21	4.21	4.53	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 230	****	3.82	4.44	4.69	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	4.10	4.31	4.58	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 218	****	3.83	4.18	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 87	****	4.68	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.43	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	4.61	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.47	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.40	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	4.76	4.50	4.65	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.26	4.19	4.58	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	4.44	4.62	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.33	4.27	4.59	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.41	4.47	4.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	3.57	4.64	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.17	4.67	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.67	4.54	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 10	****	4.40	4.84	4.90	****

Course-Section: EDUC 781S 2302
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 634
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	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	10	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101
 Title PRACTICUM IN ED SEC 7-
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 635
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	363/1670	4.75	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	226/1406	4.86	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	423/1615	4.63	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	354/1566	4.57	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	368/1528	4.57	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	471/1650	4.57	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.50	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	257/1384	4.75	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	312/1378	4.88	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	25/ 41	4.80	4.76	4.50	4.65	4.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	22/ 38	4.40	4.26	4.19	4.58	4.40	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.44	4.62	4.65	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	17/ 39	4.50	4.33	4.27	4.59	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 31	5.00	4.41	4.47	4.59	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		0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		7				
				?	0							

Course-Section: EDUC 791S 0101
 Title PRAC IN ED TESOL K-12
 Instructor: WILSON, MARGARE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 636
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	6	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.48	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	233/1666	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.50	4.32	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	552/1615	4.50	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	559/1566	4.33	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	157/1528	4.83	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1008/1650	4.17	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1022/1559	4.40	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	816/1549	4.40	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1032/1546	4.20	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	205/1384	4.83	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	405/ 904	4.20	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.20

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101
 Title INT IN EDU TESOL K-12
 Instructor: STEIN, HOLLIS G
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 637
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	259/1666	4.80	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1566	****	4.14	4.07	4.20	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1528	4.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	272/1650	4.75	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1256/1667	4.40	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.27	4.11	4.20	3.67

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	53/ 87	4.80	4.68	4.65	4.61	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	47/ 79	4.75	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	4.61	4.57	4.66	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	41/ 79	4.60	4.47	4.45	4.58	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/ 80	4.75	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.75

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	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	4	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 793 2301
 Title INTERNSHIP IN EDUCATIO
 Instructor: ZONGKER, SHIRLE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 638
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	440/1670	4.70	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	799/1406	4.33	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1018/1615	4.11	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	354/1566	4.57	4.14	4.07	4.20	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	1	6	4.10	1079/1650	4.10	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1082/1667	4.60	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1092/1559	4.33	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1090/1560	4.67	4.86	4.72	4.81	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1549	****	4.53	4.31	4.37	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1546	****	4.43	4.32	4.40	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1323	****	4.12	4.00	4.03	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	403/1384	4.56	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	379/1378	4.78	4.68	4.29	4.42	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	417/1378	4.78	4.75	4.31	4.51	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	580/ 904	3.88	4.34	4.03	4.04	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	4.68	4.65	4.61	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	47/ 79	4.75	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	41/ 75	4.75	4.61	4.57	4.66	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.47	4.45	4.58	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	25/ 80	4.60	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 794 0101
 Title ISD PROJECT SEMINAR
 Instructor: KINERNEY, DONNA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 639
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1566/1670	3.40	4.48	4.31	4.46	3.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1037/1666	4.20	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	446/1615	4.60	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1549/1566	2.25	4.14	4.07	4.20	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1122/1528	3.80	4.42	4.12	4.33	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1503/1650	3.40	4.43	4.22	4.30	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.83	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	63/ 87	4.60	4.68	4.65	4.61	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	69/ 79	4.00	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	37/ 75	4.80	4.61	4.57	4.66	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	68/ 79	3.80	4.47	4.45	4.58	3.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	59/ 80	3.40	4.40	3.97	4.32	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 798 2321
 Title INTERN SEMIN IN ELEM E
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 640
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	665/1670	4.50	4.48	4.31	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.34	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	874/1615	4.25	4.51	4.24	4.33	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1478/1566	3.00	4.14	4.07	4.20	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.42	4.12	4.33	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	570/1650	4.50	4.43	4.22	4.30	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.83	4.67	4.74	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	953/1626	4.00	4.27	4.11	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.59	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.86	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.53	4.31	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1179/1323	3.00	4.12	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	324/1384	4.67	4.50	4.10	4.21	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	179/ 904	4.67	4.34	4.03	4.04	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	69/ 87	4.33	4.68	4.65	4.61	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	62/ 79	4.33	4.43	4.64	4.67	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	53/ 75	4.33	4.61	4.57	4.66	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 79	4.67	4.47	4.45	4.58	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/ 80	4.67	4.40	3.97	4.32	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.76	4.50	4.65	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.26	4.19	4.58	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	32/ 38	4.33	4.44	4.62	4.65	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	21/ 39	4.33	4.33	4.27	4.59	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	19/ 31	4.33	4.41	4.47	4.59	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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