

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: LENNON, NICHOLA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 570
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.42	4.30	4.35	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	555/1576	4.55	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	998/1520	4.09	4.46	4.25	4.26	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	596/1465	4.30	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	836/1434	4.10	4.37	4.14	4.06	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	690/1547	4.40	4.24	4.19	4.22	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.80	4.64	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	772/1554	4.15	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.58	4.47	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	561/1486	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.29	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	921/1489	4.25	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	309/1277	4.45	4.10	4.03	4.01	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.53	4.17	4.14	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.69	4.35	4.30	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.73	4.35	4.29	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	122/ 878	4.86	4.36	4.05	3.92	4.86	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.21	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 571
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.42	4.30	4.35	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	555/1576	4.55	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.68	4.32	4.41	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	998/1520	4.09	4.46	4.25	4.26	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	596/1465	4.30	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	836/1434	4.10	4.37	4.14	4.06	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	690/1547	4.40	4.24	4.19	4.22	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.80	4.64	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	871/1554	4.15	4.08	4.10	4.05	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.58	4.47	4.44	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	678/1486	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.29	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	997/1489	4.25	4.39	4.32	4.31	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	404/1277	4.45	4.10	4.03	4.01	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.53	4.17	4.14	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.69	4.35	4.30	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.73	4.35	4.29	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	122/ 878	4.86	4.36	4.05	3.92	4.86	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.21	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 572
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	277/1576	4.70	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1576	4.79	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	4.81	4.68	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	4.86	4.46	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1465	4.88	4.29	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1434	4.91	4.37	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1547	4.82	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	911/1574	4.61	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1554	4.66	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.76	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486	4.84	4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	4.78	4.39	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1277	4.79	4.10	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1279	4.88	4.53	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1270	4.75	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	179/ 878	4.59	4.36	4.05	4.09	4.63	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.08	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.32	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	4.88	4.41	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	4.88	4.65	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	4.75	4.58	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.08	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 572
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0201
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION
 Instructor: DANNA, S
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 573
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	471/1576	4.70	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	364/1576	4.79	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	455/1342	4.81	4.68	4.32	4.30	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	291/1520	4.86	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	206/1465	4.88	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	146/1434	4.91	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	238/1547	4.82	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	1033/1574	4.61	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	449/1554	4.66	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	722/1488	4.76	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	437/1486	4.84	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	625/1489	4.78	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	273/1277	4.79	4.10	4.03	4.11	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	262/1279	4.88	4.53	4.17	4.20	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	636/1270	4.75	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	204/ 878	4.59	4.36	4.05	4.09	4.56	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.37	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	25/ 48	4.88	4.41	4.40	3.92	4.88	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	29/ 44	4.88	4.65	4.73	4.63	4.88	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.50	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	145/ 326	4.75	4.58	4.03	4.23	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	13

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 574
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	485/1576	4.14	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	698/1576	4.46	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	770/1342	4.23	4.68	4.32	4.30	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	707/1520	4.39	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	606/1465	3.79	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	138/1434	4.45	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	217/1547	4.49	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	1041/1574	4.74	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	584/1554	4.02	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	355/1488	4.82	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1493	4.87	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	191/1486	4.84	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	274/1489	4.68	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	366/1277	4.42	4.10	4.03	4.11	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	589/1279	3.89	4.53	4.17	4.20	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	378/1270	4.46	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	222/1269	4.68	4.73	4.35	4.41	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	294/ 878	4.19	4.36	4.05	4.09	4.38	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B 1					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major 18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	15			
				? 0					

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 575
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1383/1576	4.14	4.42	4.30	4.30	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	668/1576	4.46	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	918/1342	4.23	4.68	4.32	4.30	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	683/1520	4.39	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	4	1	5	3.29	1331/1465	3.79	4.29	4.12	4.09	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	852/1434	4.45	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	900/1547	4.49	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.74	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1227/1554	4.02	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	401/1488	4.82	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	810/1493	4.87	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	271/1486	4.84	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	660/1489	4.68	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	404/1277	4.42	4.10	4.03	4.11	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	1	2	3.43	1097/1279	3.89	4.53	4.17	4.20	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	881/1270	4.46	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	711/1269	4.68	4.73	4.35	4.41	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.19	4.36	4.05	4.09	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 313 0101
 Title PEER ASSISTED LRNING I
 Instructor: BICHY, CASSIE J
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 576
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.09	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.11	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.09	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 314 0101
 Title PEER ASSISTED LRNING I
 Instructor: BICHY, CASSIE J
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 577
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.09	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.08	4.10	4.09	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.20	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.09	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101
 Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO
 Instructor: DANNA, SANDRA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 578
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	266/1576	4.79	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	244/1576	4.79	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	5	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	311/1520	4.69	4.46	4.25	4.25	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.29	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	226/1434	4.71	4.37	4.14	4.15	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	280/1547	4.71	4.24	4.19	4.21	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.80	4.64	4.61	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.58	4.47	4.47	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.70	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.39	4.32	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	608/1277	4.17	4.10	4.03	4.11	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.90	4.53	4.17	4.20	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.69	4.35	4.42	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.73	4.35	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	139/ 878	4.75	4.36	4.05	4.09	4.75	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0101
 Title: READ CONTNT AREA I
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 579
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	787/1576	3.64	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	350/1576	3.54	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	805/1520	4.15	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	596/1465	3.86	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	748/1434	3.79	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	527/1547	3.44	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1041/1574	4.40	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	772/1554	3.24	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1072/1488	3.71	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	810/1493	3.53	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	922/1486	3.34	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	813/1489	3.14	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	404/1277	3.34	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	296/1279	3.77	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	3.52	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.26	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	197/ 878	3.99	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.57	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 52	3.54	4.79	4.48	4.70	4.75	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	27/ 48	3.42	4.41	4.40	4.30	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	2.00	4.65	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	1.33	4.39	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 410 0201
 Title READ CONTNT AREA I
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, NICOL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 580
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	1	0	2.88	1552/1576	3.64	4.42	4.30	4.46	2.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	2.38	1570/1576	3.54	4.37	4.27	4.35	2.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1342	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.15	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1282/1465	3.86	4.29	4.12	4.22	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	2	1	3.38	1274/1434	3.79	4.37	4.14	4.30	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	1	1	1	2.38	1523/1547	3.44	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1324/1574	4.40	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	3	3	0	0	2.29	1540/1554	3.24	4.08	4.10	4.24	2.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1444/1488	3.71	4.58	4.47	4.55	3.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	4	1	0	1	2.25	1493/1493	3.53	4.80	4.73	4.80	2.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1477/1486	3.34	4.43	4.32	4.41	2.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	3	0	0	1.88	1484/1489	3.14	4.39	4.32	4.38	1.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	2	0	1	1	2.29	1255/1277	3.34	4.10	4.03	4.04	2.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1221/1279	3.77	4.53	4.17	4.31	2.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1255/1270	3.52	4.69	4.35	4.53	2.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1067/1269	4.26	4.73	4.35	4.55	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	742/ 878	3.99	4.36	4.05	4.33	3.40	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.22	4.01	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	50/ 52	3.54	4.79	4.48	4.70	2.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	47/ 48	3.42	4.41	4.40	4.30	2.33	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	44/ 44	2.00	4.65	4.73	4.60	2.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	45/ 45	1.33	4.39	4.57	4.34	1.33	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	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	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	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0101
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 581
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	6	7	3.94	1203/1576	3.97	4.42	4.30	4.46	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	900/1576	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	4.33	4.68	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	376/1520	4.48	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	947/1465	4.01	4.29	4.12	4.22	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	575/1547	4.53	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	1018/1574	4.63	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	881/1554	4.23	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	505/1488	4.71	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	632/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	607/1486	4.57	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	696/1489	4.58	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	385/1277	4.55	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	350/1279	4.70	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	523/1270	4.76	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	409/1269	4.77	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	245/ 878	4.56	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.46	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	3.08	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.70	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.08	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0101
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 581
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0201
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 582
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	1148/1576	3.97	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	608/1576	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	768/1520	4.48	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	808/1465	4.01	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	434/1547	4.53	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	911/1574	4.63	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	571/1554	4.23	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	666/1488	4.71	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	734/1493	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	584/1486	4.57	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	500/1489	4.58	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	4.55	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	262/1279	4.70	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.76	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	444/1269	4.77	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	164/ 878	4.56	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	3.08	4.23	4.28	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.52	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.08	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 412 0201
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR
 Instructor: SINGER, JONATHA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 582
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 414 0101
 Title ADOLESCENT LITERATURE
 Instructor: STOVER, LOIS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 583
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1396/1547	3.33	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	666/1488	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	891/1486	4.17	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	888/1489	4.17	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.50	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 414 0101
 Title ADOLESCENT LITERATURE
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN, (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 584
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1396/1547	3.33	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.58	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.17	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1118/1489	4.17	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.50	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 416 0101
 Title MATERIALS TCH READ
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 585
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	988/1576	4.22	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	542/1576	4.56	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	614/1520	4.44	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	360/1434	4.56	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	871/1547	4.22	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	972/1574	4.63	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1020/1489	4.17	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	608/1277	4.17	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.36	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 418 0101
 Title INSTRUCTION OF READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 586
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	568/1576	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	3	3.78	1303/1576	3.78	4.37	4.27	4.35	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	453/1520	4.56	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	1	2	0	2.11	1537/1547	2.11	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	355/1488	4.83	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0101
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 587
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.90	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.90	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	4.10	4.29	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.90	4.37	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	3.60	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.69	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	4.67	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.67	4.36	4.05	4.33	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.70	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.30	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.60	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 45	4.00	4.39	4.57	4.34	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	251/ 326	3.00	4.58	4.03	3.97	3.00	

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	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 419 0201
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 588
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	243/1576	4.90	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	996/1576	4.60	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.90	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	3.20	1347/1465	4.10	4.29	4.12	4.22	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	151/1434	4.90	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	900/1547	3.60	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	603/1279	4.67	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	322/ 878	3.67	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.33	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	3.00	4.58	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	3.88	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 420 0101
 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH
 Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 589
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	2.83	4.08	4.10	4.24	2.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	225/ 234	3.00	3.08	4.23	4.28	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.70	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.30	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.60	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.34	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 420 0101
 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 590
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.33	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	225/ 234	3.00	3.08	4.23	4.28	3.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.70	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.30	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.60	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.34	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 421 0101
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SC
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 591
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	11	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	152/1576	4.91	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1520	4.91	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	122/1465	4.91	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	146/1434	4.82	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	179/1547	4.82	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.82	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.71	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1488	****	4.58	4.47	4.55	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1493	****	4.80	4.73	4.80	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	****	4.43	4.32	4.41	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1489	****	4.39	4.32	4.38	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.10	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.91	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.82	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1269	4.82	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	175/ 878	4.64	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.64	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 422 0101
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES: ELEM S
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 592
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	305/1434	4.63	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1227/1574	4.38	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	532/1554	4.40	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1486	4.71	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 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 5
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 593
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	3	4	4.10	1089/1576	4.10	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1438/1576	3.40	4.37	4.27	4.35	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	805/1520	4.30	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	798/1465	4.10	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1081/1554	3.88	4.08	4.10	4.24	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	1111/1488	4.25	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	1300/1486	3.63	4.43	4.32	4.41	3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1050/1489	4.13	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	889/1277	3.75	4.10	4.03	4.04	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	400/ 878	4.20	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.70	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	43/ 48	3.00	4.41	4.40	4.30	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	33/ 45	4.33	4.39	4.57	4.34	4.33
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	170/ 326	3.67	4.58	4.03	3.97	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 441 0101
 Title MATERIALS FOR EARLY LI
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 594
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	485/1576	4.61	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	179/1520	4.83	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	529/1465	4.39	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	360/1434	4.56	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	281/1574	4.94	4.80	4.64	4.69	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	281/1554	4.64	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	547/1488	4.73	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	2	12	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	856/1277	3.80	4.10	4.03	4.04	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	358/1279	4.64	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269	4.91	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	207/ 878	4.55	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.55	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 442 0101
 Title PROCESS SEM ECE - MEDI
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 595
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1547	4.80	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.08	4.10	4.24	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.36	4.05	4.33	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	3.90	****

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 447 0101
 Title TCHNG RDG & WRITING EC
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 596
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	513/1465	4.40	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	585/1277	4.20	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	4.36	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 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		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 457 0101
 Title SCNDRY INTRNSHP SEMINA
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 597
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	187/1576	4.88	4.42	4.30	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.68	4.32	4.46	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.38	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.29	4.12	4.22	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	797/1434	4.14	4.37	4.14	4.30	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1182/1547	3.86	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	1340/1554	3.43	4.08	4.10	4.24	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.58	4.47	4.55	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.40	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.43	4.32	4.41	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.10	4.03	4.04	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.36	4.05	4.33	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	83/ 85	3.50	4.41	4.72	4.77	3.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	78/ 79	3.50	4.54	4.69	4.69	3.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	80/ 80	3.00	4.31	4.61	4.52	3.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	371/ 375	2.50	4.22	4.01	3.90	2.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.70	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	40/ 48	3.67	4.41	4.40	4.30	3.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.65	4.73	4.60	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 45	4.67	4.39	4.57	4.34	4.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	157/ 326	4.00	4.58	4.03	3.97	4.00	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Other 8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 501 2301
 Title USING TECH SCIENCE/MAT
 Instructor: FLOWERS,
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 598
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	7	0	2	3	0	2.08	1574/1576	2.08	4.42	4.30	4.43	2.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	0	0	2.17	1575/1576	2.17	4.37	4.27	4.32	2.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	2	2	3	2	0	2.56	1509/1520	2.56	4.46	4.25	4.36	2.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	4	0	0	2.00	1460/1465	2.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	2	3	1	0	2.10	1431/1434	2.10	4.37	4.14	4.35	2.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	1518/1547	2.45	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	6	2	1	1	0	1.70	1551/1554	1.70	4.08	4.10	4.18	1.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	8	2	1	0	0	1.36	1488/1488	1.36	4.58	4.47	4.52	1.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	4	2	3	3.55	1470/1493	3.55	4.80	4.73	4.80	3.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	4	2	0	2.50	1471/1486	2.50	4.43	4.32	4.37	2.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	1	2	1	0	1.73	1485/1489	1.73	4.39	4.32	4.38	1.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	1	3	1	1	2.40	1248/1277	2.40	4.10	4.03	4.08	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	4	0	1	2.42	1260/1279	2.42	4.53	4.17	4.34	2.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	4	2	4	1	1	2.42	1252/1270	2.42	4.69	4.35	4.53	2.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	6	1	1	2.75	1239/1269	2.75	4.73	4.35	4.55	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	849/ 878	2.50	4.36	4.05	4.11	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	2	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	234/ 234	1.33	3.08	4.23	4.36	1.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	240/ 240	1.00	3.47	4.35	4.37	1.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	245/ 375	3.25	4.22	4.01	4.10	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	40/ 40	2.00	4.25	4.60	4.50	2.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	35/ 35	1.33	4.08	4.67	4.33	1.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****	

Course-Section: EDUC 501 2301
 Title USING TECH SCIENCE/MAT
 Instructor: FLOWERS,
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 598
 JUL 2, 2009
 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 10	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 9 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0101
 Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI
 Instructor: FILBERT, TERESA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 599
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1576	4.89	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	256/1576	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	176/1434	4.78	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	720/1574	4.78	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	504/1554	4.43	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	309/1277	4.50	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1279	4.89	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.67
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00

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	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	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 602 0101
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 600
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.46	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.31	4.61	4.70	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.22	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.65	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	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	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 603 8010
 Title INSTR SYS DEV II
 Instructor: PETSKA, DEBORAH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 601
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	163/1576	4.91	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	138/1520	4.91	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	546/1465	4.36	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	110/1434	4.91	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1486	4.73	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	194/1489	4.91	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	258/1277	4.60	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1279	4.91	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269	4.91	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	127/ 878	4.82	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.82	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101
 Title INSTRUCT READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 602
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	996/1576	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1534/1547	2.20	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1202/1574	4.40	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	813/1489	4.40	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	856/1277	3.80	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	962/1279	3.75	4.53	4.17	4.34	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.50	

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

Course-Section: EDUC 614 0101
 Title ADOLESCENT LITERATURE
 Instructor: STOVER, LOIS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 603
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.42	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.50	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	678/1486	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 614 0101
 Title ADOLESCENT LITERATURE
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN, (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 604
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.75	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	623/1554	4.42	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	4.50	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1101/1486	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 615 0101
 Title MATERIALS TEACH READ
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 605
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	206/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1313/1489	3.50	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1219/1277	2.67	4.10	4.03	4.08	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 622 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT
 Instructor: ALBRIGHT, DEBOR
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 606
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.65	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 625 0101
 Title TEACH READ WRIT ESL I
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 607
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	289/1576	4.77	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	121/1576	4.92	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	333/1342	4.73	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	311/1520	4.69	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	347/1465	4.54	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	134/1434	4.85	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	237/1554	4.70	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	198/1488	4.92	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1486	4.92	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	10	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	489/1277	4.31	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	373/1279	4.62	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	317/1270	4.85	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	342/1269	4.85	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 644 0101
 Title LING/ESOL EDUCATORS
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 608
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	335/1576	4.73	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	313/1576	4.73	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	541/1342	4.55	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	225/1465	4.73	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1434	4.80	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1547	4.90	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1048/1574	4.55	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1486	4.73	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	356/1277	4.45	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	603/ 878	3.80	4.36	4.05	4.11	3.80	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 648 8010
 Title CONSULTING
 Instructor: BUELOW, JOHN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 609
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	350/1576	4.70	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	122/1465	4.90	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1434	4.80	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.90	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	974/1277	3.60	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.90	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	179/ 878	4.63	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.63	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 610
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	429/1576	4.65	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	364/1576	4.68	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	187/1465	4.79	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	243/1434	4.70	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	2	0	15	4.61	399/1547	4.61	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	281/1554	4.65	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	442/1488	4.79	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	201/1277	4.68	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	279/1279	4.74	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	269/1270	4.89	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	17	4.79	409/1269	4.79	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	214/ 878	4.53	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.53	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.08	4.23	4.36	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.37	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.41	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.46	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.31	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.22	4.01	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.65	4.73	4.88	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP
 Instructor: SMITH JR, MURDU
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 610
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	14	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	6	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 655 0101
 Title TCH READ WRIT ESL II
 Instructor: LINVILLE, HEATH
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 611
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	709/1342	4.40	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	616/1465	4.29	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	816/1434	4.13	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1177/1574	4.43	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1167/1493	4.56	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	976/1489	4.22	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	638/1277	4.13	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	204/ 878	4.56	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.56	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 656 0101
 Title TCH READ WRIT ECE
 Instructor: SCULLY, PATRICI
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 612
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1576	4.89	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	166/1576	4.89	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	176/1434	4.78	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1547	4.78	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	5	1	3.63	963/1277	3.63	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	296/1279	4.71	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	197/ 878	4.57	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 3
Grad.	6	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 658 0101
 Title READING CONTENT AREA I
 Instructor: NORTH-COLEMAN,
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 613
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	500/1576	3.97	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	476/1576	3.80	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	395/1520	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	304/1465	4.40	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	243/1434	3.75	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	4.30	784/1547	3.32	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	866/1574	4.68	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	355/1554	3.48	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.28	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	4.25	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1486	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	637/1489	3.44	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	366/1277	3.81	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	312/1279	4.35	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	355/1270	4.40	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	278/1269	4.45	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	135/ 878	4.29	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.78	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 52	4.83	4.79	4.48	4.40	4.83	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	38/ 48	3.83	4.41	4.40	4.76	3.83	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	31/ 44	4.80	4.65	4.73	4.88	4.80	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	44/ 45	3.67	4.39	4.57	4.65	3.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	142/ 326	4.67	4.58	4.03	4.10	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 658 0201
 Title: READING CONTENT AREA I
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, NICOL
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 614
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1494/1576	3.97	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.80	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	3.00	****/1342	4.60	4.68	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1400/1520	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.40	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	1402/1434	3.75	4.37	4.14	4.35	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	2.33	1527/1547	3.32	4.24	4.19	4.24	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	911/1574	4.68	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	2.40	1533/1554	3.48	4.08	4.10	4.18	2.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1368/1488	4.28	4.58	4.47	4.52	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	1473/1493	4.25	4.80	4.73	4.80	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1421/1486	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	0	0	2.33	1475/1489	3.44	4.39	4.32	4.38	2.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1128/1277	3.81	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/1279	4.35	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	928/1270	4.40	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	928/1269	4.45	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	603/ 878	4.29	4.36	4.05	4.11	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	4.83	4.79	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	3.83	4.41	4.40	4.76	****	

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

Course-Section: EDUC 665 0101
 Title CREATIVE MEDIA-ECE
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 615
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	3.08	4.23	4.36	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	3.47	4.35	4.37	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	5.00	4.29	4.47	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 379	5.00	5.00	4.20	4.37	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.77	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.46	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.31	4.61	4.70	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.22	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.39	4.57	4.65	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.25	4.60	4.50	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.80	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.08	4.67	4.33	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	4.75	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Course-Section: EDUC 665 0101
 Title CREATIVE MEDIA-ECE
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 615
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	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	2	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 667 0101
 Title GRAMMAR FOR AMER ENGL
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 616
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	13	4.71	359/1576	4.71	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	16	4.82	208/1576	4.82	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	233/1342	4.81	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	302/1520	4.71	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	323/1434	4.60	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	148/1547	4.87	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	208/1554	4.73	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	610/1488	4.71	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	607/1493	4.88	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	584/1486	4.59	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	1	14	4.47	731/1489	4.47	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	2	9	4.07	783/1279	4.07	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	1	11	4.40	736/1270	4.40	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	0	13	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 7	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	1	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 10	
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	0	
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		11
			? 2			

Course-Section: Educ 668 0101
 Title Creating an E-Portfolio
 Instructor: Huang, Yi Ping
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 4
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1148/1576	****	4.51	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1345/1576	****	4.33	4.27	4.18	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1342	****	4.50	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1041/1520	****	4.35	4.25	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1166/1465	****	4.27	4.12	4.02	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1142/1434	****	4.42	4.14	3.94	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1303/1547	****	4.22	4.19	4.10	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1367/1574	****	4.78	4.64	4.59	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	827/1554	****	4.24	4.10	4.01	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1233/1488	****	4.55	4.47	4.41	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	986/1493	****	4.90	4.73	4.65	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1215/1486	****	4.54	4.32	4.26	3.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	1270/1489	****	4.49	4.32	4.22	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	829/1277	****	4.26	4.03	3.91	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	4	4.00	802/1279	****	4.66	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	582/1270	****	4.76	4.35	4.09	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	****	4.81	4.35	4.09	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	631/ 878	****	4.28	4.05	3.91	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.47	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	228/ 240	****	3.81	4.35	4.29	3.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.82	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.69	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.82	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	76/ 85	****	4.40	4.72	4.52	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	79/ 79	****	3.33	4.69	4.52	3.33	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	****	****	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	70/ 80	****	4.00	4.61	4.55	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	232/ 375	****	4.39	4.01	3.78	3.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.96	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	36/ 40	****	3.67	4.60	4.44	3.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	4.95	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section:
 Title
 Instructor:
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 4
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	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	8	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101
 Title ASSESS READING
 Instructor: SHELTON, NANCY
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 617
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1576	4.06	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	339/1520	4.27	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	4.33	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.56	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	3.22	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	4.89	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	4.07	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.63	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.19	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	4.21	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	4.64	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	773/1269	4.31	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 878	4.42	4.36	4.05	4.11	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 45	4.67	4.39	4.57	4.65	4.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	142/ 326	4.67	4.58	4.03	4.10	4.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 618
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1148/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	1	3.44	1419/1576	4.06	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1185/1520	4.27	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	3.67	1166/1465	4.33	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	473/1434	4.56	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	4	2	3.44	1366/1547	3.22	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	720/1574	4.89	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	5	0	1	3.14	1420/1554	4.07	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	1111/1488	4.63	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1330/1486	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1352/1489	4.19	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1020/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1097/1279	4.21	4.53	4.17	4.34	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	814/1270	4.64	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	803/1269	4.31	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	589/ 878	4.42	4.36	4.05	4.11	3.83	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.22	4.01	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	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	5	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 619
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	787/1576	4.40	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	921/1520	4.20	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	244/1465	4.70	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1110/1554	3.83	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	786/1488	4.57	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	607/1493	4.89	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	763/1486	4.44	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	766/1489	4.44	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	366/1277	4.44	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	510/1279	4.44	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	614/1269	4.56	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.33	

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 6 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 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		

Course-Section: EDUC 679 0101
 Title OBSERVATION & ASSESSME
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 620
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1420/1576	3.57	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1428/1576	3.43	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1130/1465	3.71	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1117/1434	3.71	4.37	4.14	4.35	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1373/1547	3.43	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1025/1574	4.57	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1334/1488	3.83	4.58	4.47	4.52	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	1375/1486	3.33	4.43	4.32	4.37	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1283/1489	3.67	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1119/1277	3.20	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	981/1279	3.71	4.53	4.17	4.34	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	602/1269	4.57	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.39	4.57	4.65	****	

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	2	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	5	Non-major	7
84-150	1	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101
 Title: METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 621
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	263/1342	4.79	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	228/1547	4.77	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	2	1	1	4	3.56	997/1277	3.56	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	135/1279	4.92	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	222/1269	4.92	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	93/ 878	4.92	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.92	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	3.08	4.23	4.36	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.37	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 689I 0101
 Title INEQUALITY IN EDUCATIO
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 622
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.46	4.25	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.37	4.14	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.25	4.60	4.50	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.80	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.08	4.67	4.33	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	4.75	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 772 8020
 Title EVALUATION & ASSESSMEN
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 623
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.80	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.15	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.18	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.25	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.30	4.24	4.19	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.22	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	4.85	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	692/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	4.93	4.53	4.17	4.34	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	4.82	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	4.93	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.13	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00

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	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: EDUC 772 8720
 Title EVALUATION & ASSESSMEN
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 624
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	500/1576	3.80	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	891/1576	4.15	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	744/1520	4.18	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	4.50	366/1465	4.75	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	398/1434	4.25	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	7	5	3.60	1303/1547	4.30	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	477/1554	4.22	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	401/1488	4.90	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	678/1486	4.25	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	461/1489	4.85	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	309/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	194/1279	4.93	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	514/1270	4.82	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	332/1269	4.93	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	361/ 878	4.13	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.26	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.58	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 1	A 20	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	20

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101
 Title PRACTICUM IN ED SEC 7-
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 625
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	697/1576	4.46	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1364/1576	3.62	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	8	2	3.62	1325/1520	3.62	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1145/1465	3.69	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	6	3	3.62	1167/1434	3.62	4.37	4.14	4.35	3.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1384/1547	3.38	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.92	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	2	6	2	3.73	1187/1554	3.73	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	0	3	5	3.91	1316/1488	3.91	4.58	4.47	4.52	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	1176/1493	4.55	4.80	4.73	4.80	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	5	5	4.18	1010/1486	4.18	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	1	6	1	3.67	943/1277	3.67	4.10	4.03	4.08	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	358/1279	4.64	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	375/1269	4.82	4.73	4.35	4.55	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	75/ 85	4.11	4.41	4.72	4.79	4.11	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	76/ 79	3.78	4.54	4.69	4.77	3.78	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	0	2	4	3.56	71/ 72	3.56	4.46	4.64	4.70	3.56	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	57/ 80	4.44	4.31	4.61	4.70	4.44	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	2	0	3	3	3.56	207/ 375	3.56	4.22	4.01	4.10	3.56	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/	52	****	4.79	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	48	****	4.41	4.40	4.76	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	45	****	4.39	4.57	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 2	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: EDUC 791S 0101
 Title PRAC IN ED TESOL K-12
 Instructor: WILSON, MARGARE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 626
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1311/1576	3.75	4.37	4.27	4.32	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1093/1434	3.75	4.37	4.14	4.35	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1553/1554	1.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	1.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1283/1489	3.67	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1219/1277	2.67	4.10	4.03	4.08	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.69	4.35	4.53	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1036/1269	3.75	4.73	4.35	4.55	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	843/ 878	2.67	4.36	4.05	4.11	2.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 627
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	197/1520	4.80	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1242/1465	3.50	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	777/1434	4.17	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.08	4.10	4.18	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.39	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	3.47	4.35	4.37	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.41	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.54	4.69	4.77	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.31	4.61	4.70	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	146/ 375	4.67	4.22	4.01	4.10	4.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.65	4.73	4.88	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 45	4.50	4.39	4.57	4.65	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.58	4.03	4.10	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.25	4.60	4.50	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.08	4.67	4.33	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 627
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 794 0101
 Title ISD PROJECT SEMINAR
 Instructor: KINERNEY, DONNA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 628
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.68	4.32	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1102/1465	3.75	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.37	4.14	4.35	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.24	4.19	4.24	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.80	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.08	4.10	4.18	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.58	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.39	4.32	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1274/1277	1.00	4.10	4.03	4.08	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	61/ 85	4.50	4.41	4.72	4.79	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	46/ 79	4.75	4.54	4.69	4.77	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.46	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	48/ 80	4.50	4.31	4.61	4.70	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	199/ 375	3.75	4.22	4.01	4.10	3.75	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.13	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 797 0101
 Title: INTERNSHIP SEM IN SEC
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 629
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	1401/1576	3.63	4.42	4.30	4.43	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	2	1	2.88	1546/1576	2.88	4.37	4.27	4.32	2.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.68	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.46	4.25	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1386/1465	3.00	4.29	4.12	4.25	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	2.86	1397/1434	2.86	4.37	4.14	4.35	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1255/1547	3.71	4.24	4.19	4.24	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.80	4.64	4.75	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1267/1554	3.60	4.08	4.10	4.18	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.58	4.47	4.52	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1298/1489	3.60	4.39	4.32	4.38	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	533/1277	4.25	4.10	4.03	4.08	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	641/1279	4.29	4.53	4.17	4.34	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.69	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.73	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	415/ 878	4.17	4.36	4.05	4.11	4.17	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	81/ 85	3.75	4.41	4.72	4.79	3.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	46/ 79	4.75	4.54	4.69	4.77	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	69/ 72	3.75	4.46	4.64	4.70	3.75	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	77/ 80	3.75	4.31	4.61	4.70	3.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	152/ 375	4.50	4.22	4.01	4.10	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.79	4.48	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	35/ 48	4.00	4.41	4.40	4.76	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	33/ 44	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.88	4.75	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	36/ 45	4.25	4.39	4.57	4.65	4.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	164/ 326	3.75	4.58	4.03	4.10	3.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.25	4.60	4.50	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.08	4.67	4.33	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.75	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	8	
?	0			