

Course-Section: EDUC 305 0101  
 Title TCHNG RDG & WRITING ECE  
 Instructor: BERMAN, JILLIAN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 511  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1438/1504	3.13	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1403/1503	3.13	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	5	4	2	3.13	1390/1453	3.13	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	5	6	3.81	935/1421	3.81	4.31	4.00	4.01	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	7	3	3	3.25	1249/1365	3.25	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	4	5	3	3.38	1319/1485	3.38	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	2	4	3	2	2.80	1415/1483	2.80	4.18	4.06	4.08	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	4	5	5	2	3.31	1336/1425	3.31	4.50	4.41	4.43	3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	1242/1426	4.31	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	5	3	4	4	3.44	1272/1418	3.44	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	4	2	1	3	2.44	1385/1416	2.44	4.35	4.26	4.27	2.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	872/1199	3.64	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	3	0	4	3	3.08	1136/1312	3.08	4.47	4.00	4.09	3.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1044/1303	3.77	4.67	4.24	4.27	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	1	2	3	5	3.62	1089/1299	3.62	4.72	4.25	4.30	3.62
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	644/ 758	3.27	4.28	4.01	4.00	3.27

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0101  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: King, Betty  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 512  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	9	5	4.00	1092/1504	4.43	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	3	7	3.88	1150/1503	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	832/1290	4.48	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	764/1453	4.56	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	5	4	3.38	1189/1421	4.04	4.31	4.00	4.01	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	4	3.88	922/1365	4.37	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	1	2	1	6	3.13	1372/1485	3.92	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	4.71	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	3	0	1	4	3	5	3.92	961/1483	4.29	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1117/1425	4.46	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	572/1426	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	4	6	3.88	1110/1418	4.34	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	1112/1416	4.34	4.35	4.26	4.27	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	748/1199	4.12	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	4	2	6	4.00	716/1312	4.50	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	415/1299	4.85	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	364/ 758	4.40	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.13
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	38/ 58	4.67	4.42	4.43	4.52	4.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	36/ 56	4.33	4.29	4.23	4.13	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	18/ 47	4.75	4.38	4.29	4.14	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 310 0301  
 Title INQUIRY INTO EDUCATION  
 Instructor: BOURNE, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 513  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	168/1504	4.43	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1503	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	250/1290	4.48	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.56	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1421	4.04	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	100/1365	4.37	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	240/1485	3.92	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1155/1504	4.71	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	211/1483	4.29	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.46	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.34	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.34	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	429/1199	4.12	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	4.50	4.47	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	4.85	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.40	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0101  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 514  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1061/1504	4.21	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	209/1503	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	290/1290	4.69	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	186/1453	4.68	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	0	5	6	4.00	745/1421	4.21	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	297/1365	4.55	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	190/1485	4.68	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	879/1504	4.72	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1483	3.95	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1425	4.83	4.50	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	4.97	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1418	4.97	4.45	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	366/1416	4.60	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	224/1199	4.69	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	414/1312	4.63	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	540/1303	4.72	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	354/ 758	4.52	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 515  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	788/1504	4.21	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	380/1503	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	344/1290	4.69	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	331/1453	4.68	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	2	10	4.43	392/1421	4.21	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	223/1365	4.55	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	349/1485	4.68	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	983/1504	4.72	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	989/1483	3.95	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	572/1425	4.83	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.97	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	88/1418	4.97	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	675/1416	4.60	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	105/1199	4.69	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	164/1312	4.63	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	197/1303	4.72	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	66/ 758	4.52	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.89
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.13	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.77	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.14	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.47	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	4.30	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	4.69	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	20	****	3.04	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	16	****	4.48	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: EDUC 311 0201  
 Title PSYC FOUNDATION OF EDU  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 515  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: EDUC 312 0101  
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 516  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	8	3	4	3.47	1364/1504	3.28	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	5	5	3.71	1231/1503	2.94	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/1290	3.45	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1221/1453	3.43	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	7	4	4	1	2.94	1327/1421	2.70	4.31	4.00	4.01	2.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	4	4	4	3.35	1218/1365	2.99	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	3	5	5	3.53	1276/1485	2.90	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	4	12	4.53	1075/1504	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	0	1	3	6	1	3.64	1183/1483	3.37	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	1076/1425	3.43	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	860/1426	4.03	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	905/1418	3.43	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	4	4	3.67	1199/1416	2.67	4.35	4.26	4.27	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	369/1199	4.40	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	804/1312	3.67	4.47	4.00	4.09	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	563/1303	4.25	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	570/1299	3.96	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	387/ 758	3.63	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						



Course-Section: EDUC 312 0201  
 Title ANALYSIS OF TCHNG & LR  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 517  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	2	2	3.08	1443/1504	3.28	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	4	1	1	1	2.18	1493/1503	2.94	4.34	4.20	4.22	2.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1165/1290	3.45	4.56	4.28	4.31	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	3	2	3.17	1383/1453	3.43	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	4	1	1	2.45	1394/1421	2.70	4.31	4.00	4.01	2.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	3	2	1	2.64	1340/1365	2.99	4.38	4.08	4.08	2.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	4	1	0	2.27	1471/1485	2.90	4.33	4.16	4.17	2.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	4.76	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	1367/1483	3.37	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1404/1425	3.43	4.50	4.41	4.43	2.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1395/1426	4.03	4.80	4.69	4.71	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1379/1418	3.43	4.45	4.25	4.26	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	1409/1416	2.67	4.35	4.26	4.27	1.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1199	4.40	4.07	3.97	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	5	2	3.42	1047/1312	3.67	4.47	4.00	4.09	3.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	910/1303	4.25	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1136/1299	3.96	4.72	4.25	4.30	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	648/ 758	3.63	4.28	4.01	4.00	3.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	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				
				?	5						

Course-Section: EDUC 317 0101  
 Title PROC & ACQUIS READ  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 518  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1504	4.88	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	125/1503	4.88	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	451/1365	4.38	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.08	5.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	85/1199	4.88	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.88
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	196/1312	4.75	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	227/1303	4.88	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	233/1299	4.88	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.86
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.25	****
-----														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	43/ 58	4.38	4.42	4.43	4.52	4.38
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	33/ 56	4.38	4.29	4.23	4.13	4.38
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/ 44	4.80	4.77	4.65	4.77	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.14	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.47	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 317 0101  
 Title PROC & ACQUIS READ  
 Instructor: TILLES,ALYSON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 519  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1504	4.88	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	125/1503	4.88	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	451/1365	4.38	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.08	5.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	85/1199	4.88	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.88
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	196/1312	4.75	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	227/1303	4.88	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	233/1299	4.88	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.86
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.25	****
-----														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	43/ 58	4.38	4.42	4.43	4.52	4.38
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	33/ 56	4.38	4.29	4.23	4.13	4.38
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/ 44	4.80	4.77	4.65	4.77	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	2	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.14	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.47	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	Electives 0
				I 0	Other 8

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



Course-Section: EDUC 318 0101  
 Title INSTRUCTION OF READING  
 Instructor: CANTOR, RONNI  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 520  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	5	1	3.63	1315/1504	3.63	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1263/1503	3.63	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1078/1290	3.75	4.56	4.28	4.31	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1123/1453	3.88	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	4.31	4.00	4.01	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	625/1485	4.38	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1238/1425	3.83	4.50	4.41	4.43	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1250/1418	3.50	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1248/1416	3.50	4.35	4.26	4.27	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1153/1199	2.40	4.07	3.97	4.02	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	572/1312	4.29	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	776/1303	4.29	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	780/1299	4.29	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 319 0101  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: BROOKS, WANDA  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 521  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	700/1504	4.40	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	795/1503	4.30	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	240/1453	4.70	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	863/1421	3.90	4.31	4.00	4.01	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	420/1365	4.40	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	98/1485	4.90	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	960/1504	4.70	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	793/1483	4.10	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	525/1425	4.70	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	926/1426	4.70	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	799/1418	4.30	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	525/1416	4.60	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	542/1199	4.20	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.43	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	523/1303	4.57	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	114/ 758	4.71	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.71

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 320 0101  
 Title TEACH MATH IN ELEM SCH  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 522  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	3	1	3.00	1453/1504	3.00	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	3	2	0	2.42	1490/1503	2.42	4.34	4.20	4.22	2.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1210/1290	3.25	4.56	4.28	4.31	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	3.00	1404/1453	3.00	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	3	1	2.75	1368/1421	2.75	4.31	4.00	4.01	2.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	1	2	3.08	1287/1365	3.08	4.38	4.08	4.08	3.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	3	2	1	2.50	1452/1485	2.50	4.33	4.16	4.17	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	2	4	2	0	2.60	1439/1483	2.60	4.18	4.06	4.08	2.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	2	2	3.33	1070/1312	3.33	4.47	4.00	4.09	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	6	1	5	3.92	983/1303	3.92	4.67	4.24	4.27	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	3	2	3	3	1	2.75	1232/1299	2.75	4.72	4.25	4.30	2.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	561/ 758	3.58	4.28	4.01	4.00	3.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	5						



Course-Section: EDUC 324 0101  
 Title PROCESS SEM IN ECE-M/S  
 Instructor: DIECKMAN, DONNA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 523  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	851/1504	4.29	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	618/1503	4.43	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	563/1453	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	642/1421	4.14	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	690/1365	4.14	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1047/1504	4.57	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	876/1425	4.43	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	682/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	554/1416	4.57	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	964/1199	3.40	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.40
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.28	4.01	4.00	****
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101  
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH  
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 524  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	146/1504	4.89	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1503	4.89	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	250/1290	4.75	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1453	4.89	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	283/1421	4.56	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1294/1504	4.22	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	121/1312	4.89	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1299	4.89	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	94/ 758	4.78	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.78

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 331 0101  
 Title SOCIAL STUDIES:ELEM SC  
 Instructor: FITZHUGH, WILLI  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 525  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	171/1503	4.80	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1365	4.80	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	349/1485	4.60	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1030/1504	4.60	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	429/1199	4.33	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	101/ 758	4.75	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.75
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	4.14	****

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	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	1	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 351 0101  
 Title SOC,EMO,&ETHICAL DEV Y  
 Instructor: FRYER, MARY  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 526  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1153/1504	3.94	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	8	3	3.61	1267/1503	3.61	4.34	4.20	4.22	3.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	752/1453	4.28	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	5	7	4.06	712/1421	4.06	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	441/1365	4.39	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	3	1	7	3.33	1330/1485	3.33	4.33	4.16	4.17	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	6	6	0	3.20	1340/1483	3.20	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.20
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	8	2	3.69	1274/1425	3.69	4.50	4.41	4.43	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	351/1426	4.94	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	8	3	3.65	1209/1418	3.65	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1205/1416	3.65	4.35	4.26	4.27	3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	3	4	5	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.00
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	290/1312	4.62	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	344/1303	4.77	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	162/1299	4.92	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	471/ 758	3.91	4.28	4.01	4.00	3.91
-----														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	38/ 56	4.25	4.29	4.23	4.13	4.25
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.14	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	27/ 39	4.29	4.57	4.44	4.47	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	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	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 352 0101  
 Title PROCESS SEM ECE-MEDIA  
 Instructor: COSTELLO, MARGA  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 527  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	495/1504	4.55	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	572/1503	4.45	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1104/1453	3.90	4.43	4.21	4.23	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	365/1421	4.45	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	731/1365	4.09	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	636/1485	4.36	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	657/1504	4.91	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1082/1425	4.18	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	828/1418	4.27	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	929/1416	4.18	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	283/1312	4.63	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.86
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 353 0101  
 Title MATERIALS FOR EARLY LI  
 Instructor: SCULLY, PAT  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 528  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	168/1504	4.85	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	240/1453	4.70	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	410/1421	4.40	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	114/1365	4.80	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	260/1485	4.70	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	3	4.16	1345/1504	4.16	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.16
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	665/1425	4.60	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	301/1426	4.95	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	390/1418	4.65	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	860/1199	3.67	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101  
 Title TUTORING AND LITERACY  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, JOBY B (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 529  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1010/1504	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	954/1503	4.14	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1421	4.71	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1302/1483	3.57	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1165/1425	3.63	4.50	4.41	4.43	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	4.50	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1418	3.75	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1416	4.00	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	833/1303	4.20	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.50	4.28	4.01	4.00	2.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	0			



Course-Section: EDUC 387 0101  
 Title TUTORING AND LITERACY  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 530  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	1010/1504	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	954/1503	4.14	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	182/1421	4.71	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1255/1504	4.29	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1093/1483	3.57	4.18	4.06	4.08	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1346/1425	3.63	4.50	4.41	4.43	3.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1163/1418	3.75	4.45	4.25	4.26	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.07	3.97	4.02	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	833/1303	4.20	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.50	4.28	4.01	4.00	2.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.13	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				P	0			
				I	0	Other	2	
				?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 388 0101  
 Title INCLUSION & INSTRUCTIO  
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 531  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	21	4.72	306/1504	4.72	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	19	4.68	301/1503	4.68	4.34	4.20	4.22	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	440/1290	4.57	4.56	4.28	4.31	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	112/1453	4.88	4.43	4.21	4.23	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	305/1421	4.52	4.31	4.00	4.01	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	211/1365	4.63	4.38	4.08	4.08	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	18	4.72	240/1485	4.72	4.33	4.16	4.17	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.83	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	322/1483	4.52	4.18	4.06	4.08	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.50	4.41	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.80	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	171/1418	4.83	4.45	4.25	4.26	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	175/1416	4.88	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	5	6	11	4.13	580/1199	4.13	4.07	3.97	4.02	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	142/1312	4.84	4.47	4.00	4.09	4.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	321/1303	4.79	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	263/1299	4.84	4.72	4.25	4.30	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	1	2	4	11	4.21	319/ 758	4.21	4.28	4.01	4.00	4.21
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	2	1	2	0	1	2.50	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.14	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	25	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	1
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I 0  
? 0

Other

25

Course-Section: EDUC 403 0101  
 Title ELEM INTRNSHP SEMINAR  
 Instructor: SMITH, DONALD  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 532  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	1038/1504	4.11	4.43	4.27	4.33	4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.34	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.43	4.21	4.22	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	370/1365	4.44	4.38	4.08	4.09	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	866/1504	4.78	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	209/1425	4.89	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	164/1416	4.89	4.35	4.26	4.26	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	****	4.07	3.97	4.05	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.67	4.24	4.34	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 758	****	4.28	4.01	4.17	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	30/ 70	4.75	4.06	4.35	4.63	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.51	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.18	4.17	4.29	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.83	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.37	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.33	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.12	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.19	****

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		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
				Graduate	9
				Under-grad	9
					Major
					Non-major
					0
					3

84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	8
				?	0		

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

Course-Section: EDUC 408 0101  
 Title SCNDRY INTRNSHP SEMINA  
 Instructor: JEFFERSON, CHER  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 533  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	864/1504	4.28	4.43	4.27	4.33	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	118/1453	4.88	4.43	4.21	4.22	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	532/1421	4.28	4.31	4.00	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	237/1365	4.59	4.38	4.08	4.09	4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.33	4.16	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1087/1504	4.50	4.83	4.69	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	173/1483	4.71	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	143/1425	4.93	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.93	4.80	4.69	4.72	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	101/1418	4.93	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	380/1416	4.71	4.35	4.26	4.26	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.07	3.97	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	176/1312	4.79	4.47	4.00	4.07	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.93	4.67	4.24	4.34	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	143/ 758	4.64	4.28	4.01	4.17	4.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.16	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.23	3.81	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	3.69	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	26/ 76	4.94	4.47	4.61	4.63	4.94
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	4	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	21/ 70	4.92	4.06	4.35	4.63	4.92
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	5	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	45/ 67	4.27	4.32	4.34	4.34	4.27
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	0	2	12	4.50	46/ 76	4.50	4.51	4.44	4.51	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	30/ 73	4.53	4.18	4.17	4.29	4.53
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	26/ 58	4.89	4.42	4.43	4.83	4.89
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	36/ 56	4.33	4.29	4.23	4.37	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.33	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	18/ 47	4.75	4.38	4.29	4.12	4.75
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	2	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	27/ 39	4.29	4.57	4.44	4.19	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						



Course-Section: EDUC 410 0101  
 Title READ CONTNT AREA I  
 Instructor: COWAN, CHARISSE  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 534  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	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	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	119/1503	4.89	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	112/1453	4.89	4.43	4.21	4.22	4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	94/1365	4.88	4.38	4.08	4.09	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	113/1485	4.88	4.33	4.16	4.14	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.07	3.97	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	196/1312	4.75	4.47	4.00	4.07	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.28	4.01	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.26	4.53	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.30	4.49	4.50	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	25/ 36	4.67	4.69	4.60	4.83	4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	3.04	4.24	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	4.48	4.51	****	****

Frequency Distribution

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

P 0  
I 0  
? 0

Other

9

responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 414 0101  
 Title ADOLESCENT LITERATURE  
 Instructor: NEUTZE, DONNA L  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 535  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	509/1504	4.53	4.43	4.27	4.33	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.56	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.43	4.21	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.02	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	274/1365	4.53	4.38	4.08	4.09	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.11	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	270/1425	4.85	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	101/1418	4.92	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	310/1416	4.77	4.35	4.26	4.26	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	748/1199	3.91	4.07	3.97	4.05	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	189/1312	4.77	4.47	4.00	4.07	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	101/ 758	4.75	4.28	4.01	4.17	4.75
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	3.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.29	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.37	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	11	
				?	0			

Course-Section: EDUC 415 0101  
 Title MATERIALS TCH READ  
 Instructor: Young, Patricia  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 536  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	429/1504	4.59	4.43	4.27	4.33	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	346/1503	4.64	4.34	4.20	4.18	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.32	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	215/1453	4.73	4.43	4.21	4.22	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	6	14	4.41	410/1421	4.41	4.31	4.00	4.02	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	205/1365	4.64	4.38	4.08	4.09	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	15	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.33	4.16	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	668/1483	4.22	4.18	4.06	4.11	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	618/1425	4.64	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.80	4.69	4.72	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	552/1418	4.52	4.45	4.25	4.25	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	2	15	4.48	662/1416	4.48	4.35	4.26	4.26	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	5	13	4.38	386/1199	4.38	4.07	3.97	4.05	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	444/1312	4.42	4.47	4.00	4.07	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	0	1	16	4.63	478/1303	4.63	4.67	4.24	4.34	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	523/1299	4.58	4.72	4.25	4.38	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	111/ 758	4.72	4.28	4.01	4.17	4.72
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.37	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.33	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.12	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.19	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.30	4.49	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.69	4.60	4.83	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	3.04	4.24	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I 0  
? 0

Other

20

Course-Section: EDUC 601 0201  
 Title HUMAN LEARNING/COGNITI  
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 537  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1029/1504	4.13	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1150/1503	3.88	4.34	4.20	4.28	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1191/1453	3.75	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	660/1421	4.13	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	708/1365	4.13	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	708/1504	4.88	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	1117/1425	4.13	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.13
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1212/1426	4.38	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1110/1418	3.88	4.45	4.25	4.36	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1112/1416	3.88	4.35	4.26	4.38	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	820/1199	3.75	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	902/1312	3.75	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1004/1303	3.88	4.67	4.24	4.58	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	798/1299	4.25	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.33
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.55	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Title

Baltimore County

JUN 14, 2005

Instructor: FRYER, MARY

Spring 2005

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4

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	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1176/1485	3.75	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1379/1483	3.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1036/1425	4.25	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	4.25	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	947/1312	3.67	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	40/ 56	4.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	40/ 47	3.50	4.38	4.29	4.41	3.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	37/ 39	3.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 602 0101  
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, VICKI  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 539  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.59	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.37	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.51	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.53	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	4.10	4.35	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	3.67	4.07	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	4.08	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1195/1303	4.01	4.67	4.24	4.58	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	4.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.71	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 0201  
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 540  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	889/1504	4.59	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1485/1503	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.28	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1261/1290	3.88	4.56	4.28	4.36	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1282/1453	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1113/1421	4.37	4.31	4.00	4.27	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1003/1365	4.51	4.38	4.08	4.35	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1348/1485	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1423/1483	3.63	4.18	4.06	4.20	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1165/1425	4.53	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1319/1426	4.47	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1250/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1378/1416	4.10	4.35	4.26	4.38	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	1190/1199	3.67	4.07	3.97	4.04	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1011/1312	4.08	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	563/1303	4.01	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	570/1299	4.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	304/ 758	3.71	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 602 8010  
 Title INSTRUCTIONAL SYS DEV  
 Instructor: HODELL, CHARLES  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 541  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	509/1504	4.59	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	171/1503	4.10	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	3.88	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	158/1453	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	241/1421	4.37	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	124/1365	4.51	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	78/1485	4.39	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.98	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	338/1483	3.63	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	665/1425	4.53	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.47	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	191/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	255/1416	4.10	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	271/1199	3.67	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	208/1312	4.08	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	1	11	4.53	546/1303	4.01	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1299	4.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	481/ 758	3.71	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.87
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	5	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	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	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 605 8030  
 Title THE ADULT LEARNER  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, GREGO (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 542  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1365/1503	3.33	4.34	4.20	4.28	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1379/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1334/1425	3.33	4.50	4.41	4.51	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1232/1426	4.33	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1330/1418	3.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1412/1416	1.00	4.35	4.26	4.38	1.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1138/1199	2.50	4.07	3.97	4.04	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	71/ 76	3.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	68/ 70	1.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	1.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	65/ 67	2.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	2.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 76	4.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	71/ 73	2.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	56/ 58	2.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	52/ 56	2.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	43/ 47	3.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	37/ 40	3.00	4.26	4.53	4.37	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 35	3.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	18/ 20	1.00	3.04	4.24	3.16	1.00

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	Graduate 1
					Major 0

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

Course-Section: EDUC 605 8030  
 Title THE ADULT LEARNER  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 543  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1365/1503	3.33	4.34	4.20	4.28	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	71/ 76	3.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	68/ 70	1.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	1.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	65/ 67	2.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	2.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 76	4.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	71/ 73	2.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	56/ 58	2.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	52/ 56	2.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	43/ 47	3.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	37/ 40	3.00	4.26	4.53	4.37	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 35	3.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	18/ 20	1.00	3.04	4.24	3.16	1.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 605 8030  
 Title THE ADULT LEARNER  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 544  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1365/1503	3.33	4.34	4.20	4.28	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1222/1485	3.67	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	71/ 76	3.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	68/ 70	1.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	1.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	65/ 67	2.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	2.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 76	4.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	71/ 73	2.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	56/ 58	2.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	2.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	52/ 56	2.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	43/ 47	3.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	37/ 40	3.00	4.26	4.53	4.37	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 35	3.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	18/ 20	1.00	3.04	4.24	3.16	1.00

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

Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101  
 Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN  
 Instructor: SMALL, SUE ELLE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 545  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	168/1504	4.86	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	363/1453	4.57	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1421	4.83	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1485	4.83	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1483	4.92	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	255/1425	4.93	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1416	4.83	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	213/1199	4.80	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 58	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47	4.67	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



I 0  
? 0

Other

6

Course-Section: EDUC 607 0101  
 Title PROCESSES & ACQ READIN  
 Instructor: TILLES, ALYSON (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 546  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	168/1504	4.86	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	414/1503	4.57	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	363/1453	4.57	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1421	4.83	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1485	4.83	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	4.92	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	4.93	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.83	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1199	4.80	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 58	4.75	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47	4.67	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

I 0  
? 0

Other

6

Course-Section: EDUC 608 0101  
 Title INSTRUCT READING  
 Instructor: CANTOR, RONNI  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 547  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	991/1504	4.17	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1168/1503	3.83	4.34	4.20	4.28	3.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1229/1453	3.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	623/1421	4.17	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	967/1365	3.80	4.38	4.08	4.35	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	866/1485	4.17	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1302/1483	3.33	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1094/1425	4.17	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	930/1418	4.17	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1050/1199	3.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	651/1312	4.17	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	328/ 758	4.20	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	40/ 58	4.50	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.55	****

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	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 610 8010  
 Title PRIN OF CBT/WBT  
 Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 548  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	306/1504	4.71	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	816/1503	4.29	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	563/1453	4.43	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	524/1421	4.29	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	890/1485	4.14	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1504	4.86	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1105/1425	4.14	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	947/1418	4.14	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	845/1416	4.29	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	230/1199	4.57	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	4.43	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	557/ 758	3.60	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 612 8010  
 Title MESSAGE DESIGN  
 Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 549  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1290	4.25	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	924/1453	4.13	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1056/1421	3.60	4.31	4.00	4.27	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	935/1365	3.86	4.38	4.08	4.35	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	1200/1485	3.71	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1123/1425	4.11	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	790/1426	4.78	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	877/1418	4.22	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	701/1416	4.44	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	593/1199	4.11	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	183/1312	4.78	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1299	4.89	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.30	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.69	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	3.04	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	4.48	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: EDUC 612 8010  
 Title MESSAGE DESIGN  
 Instructor: WALSH, GREGORY  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 549  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 620 8010  
 Title DEV CBT/WBT MATERIALS  
 Instructor: AHMAD, RAFI E  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 550  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.67	4.09	4.56	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.69	4.40	4.66	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 40	4.00	4.26	4.53	4.37	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 35	4.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.69	4.60	4.75	5.00

Course-Section: EDUC 620 8010  
 Title DEV CBT/WBT MATERIALS  
 Instructor: AHMAD, RAFI E  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 550  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	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	0	Non-major	0
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 622 0101  
 Title INSTRUC STRGY ELEM MAT  
 Instructor: KINACH, BARBARA  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 551  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	5	1	3	0	2.78	1479/1504	2.78	4.43	4.27	4.44	2.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	0	2.67	1472/1503	2.67	4.34	4.20	4.28	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	0	4	0	2.89	1427/1453	2.89	4.43	4.21	4.34	2.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	2	0	0	1.63	1421/1421	1.63	4.31	4.00	4.27	1.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1319/1365	2.88	4.38	4.08	4.35	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1434/1485	2.71	4.33	4.16	4.24	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	3	2	3	0	0	2.00	1468/1483	2.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	2.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1425	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	****	4.80	4.69	4.80	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1418	****	4.45	4.25	4.36	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1416	****	4.35	4.26	4.38	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	****	4.07	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	3	0	2.44	1255/1312	2.44	4.47	4.00	4.31	2.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1108/1303	3.56	4.67	4.24	4.58	3.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	4	0	2	3.11	1189/1299	3.11	4.72	4.25	4.56	3.11
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	1	1	5	0	3.25	648/ 758	3.25	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	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	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	8						

Course-Section: EDUC 636 0101  
 Title ESL/FOR LANG TEST & EV  
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 552  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	672/1365	4.17	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1061/1483	3.83	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	967/1426	4.67	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	930/1418	4.17	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	919/1199	3.50	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1025/1299	3.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	3.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	614/ 758	3.40	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.40

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

Course-Section: EDUC 640 8010  
 Title PROG CBT/WBT MATERIALS  
 Instructor: KELLERMAN, PAUL  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 553  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	198/1504	4.82	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	449/1503	4.55	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1191/1453	3.75	4.43	4.21	4.34	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	194/1421	4.70	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	547/1365	4.29	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	412/1485	4.55	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	812/1504	4.82	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	772/1483	4.13	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	474/1425	4.73	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	526/1418	4.55	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	854/1416	4.27	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	479/1199	4.27	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	2	3.55	997/1312	3.55	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	889/1303	4.09	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	714/1299	4.36	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 758	****	4.28	4.01	4.24	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	102/ 233	4.33	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	83/ 244	4.50	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.50
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	125/ 227	4.50	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.83	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	59/ 76	4.50	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	57/ 70	4.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	69/ 76	3.50	4.51	4.44	4.39	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.26	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.30	4.49	4.46	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	36	****	4.69	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	20	****	3.04	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	16	****	4.48	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: EDUC 640 8010  
 Title            PROG CBT/WBT MATERIALS  
 Instructor:     KELLERMAN, PAUL  
 Enrollment:     14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 553  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	5	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 648 8010  
 Title CONSULTING  
 Instructor: ERDMAN, CAROL B  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 554  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	151/1503	4.83	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	105/1365	4.83	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1337/1504	4.17	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1483	4.75	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1138/1199	2.50	4.07	3.97	4.04	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	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	3	Under-grad	4	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						



Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101  
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP  
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 555  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	367/1504	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	324/1503	4.65	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	180/1290	4.83	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	240/1453	4.70	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	548/1421	4.25	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	12	4.26	750/1485	4.26	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	587/1425	4.65	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	301/1426	4.95	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	261/1418	4.75	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	407/1416	4.70	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	3	4	7	3.76	815/1199	3.76	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	176/1312	4.79	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	207/1303	4.89	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	425/1299	4.68	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	178/ 758	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.53
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.55	4.09	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.42	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.77	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.57	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.26	4.53	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.30	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	4.69	4.60	4.75	****

Course-Section: EDUC 650 0101  
 Title EDUC IN CULTURAL PERSP  
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 555  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	10	Non-major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 655 0101  
 Title TCH READ WRIT ESL II  
 Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 556  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	639/1504	4.44	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	928/1503	4.18	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	429/1421	4.39	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	370/1365	4.44	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	0	1	9	4	3.65	1230/1485	3.65	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	1	12	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	1072/1418	3.94	4.45	4.25	4.36	3.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	4	10	4.31	821/1416	4.31	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	610/1199	4.08	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	11	4.29	565/1312	4.29	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	770/1303	4.29	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	848/1299	4.18	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	7	5	4	3.65	542/ 758	3.65	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.65
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.80	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 658 0101  
 Title READING CONTENT AREA I  
 Instructor: COWAN, CHARISSE  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 557  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean						Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.35	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 56	4.50	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	30/ 39	4.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.26	4.53	4.37	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.69	4.60	4.75	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	13/ 16	4.00	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 659 0101  
 Title READ CONTNT AREA II  
 Instructor: COWAN, CHARISSE  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 558  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
-----														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.29	4.23	4.26	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	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	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	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 669 0101  
 Title ASSESS READING  
 Instructor: BROOKS, WANDA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 559  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1504	4.83	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1290	4.80	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1421	4.60	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	114/1365	4.80	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	830/1504	4.80	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.83	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 671 8030  
 Title PRIN OF TRNG AND DEV  
 Instructor: BERGE, ZANE  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 560  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	211/1483	4.67	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.67
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 76	4.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.00
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	4.26	4.53	4.37	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.30	4.49	4.46	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	29/ 36	4.00	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 678 0101  
 Title INST STRAT/DIV NEEDS  
 Instructor: BERGE, NANCY B  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 561  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course		Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	131/1504	4.91	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	106/1503	4.91	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	123/1421	4.82	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	111/1365	4.82	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	412/1485	4.55	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	525/1425	4.70	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	342/1418	4.70	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	242/1199	4.56	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	121/1312	4.89	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	94/ 758	4.78	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.78
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	50/ 58	3.33	4.42	4.43	4.31	3.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 56	****	4.29	4.23	4.26	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.38	4.29	4.41	****

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	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 680 8720  
 Title SEMINAR IN TEACHER RSC  
 Instructor: JEFFERSON, CHER  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 562  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	376/1504	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	891/1503	4.21	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1453	4.75	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	459/1421	4.36	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	169/1365	4.70	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	180/1485	4.78	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	492/1425	4.71	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	401/1426	4.93	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	488/1418	4.57	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	472/1416	4.64	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	176/1312	4.79	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.93	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	121/ 758	4.70	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.70
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	40/ 76	4.80	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	34/ 70	4.70	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.70
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	32/ 67	4.70	4.32	4.34	4.48	4.70
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	28/ 76	4.80	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	25/ 73	4.70	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.70

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 688 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGY TEACH ESL  
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 563  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	131/1504	4.91	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	164/1503	4.82	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	280/1290	4.73	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	215/1453	4.73	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	449/1421	4.36	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	154/1365	4.73	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	98/1485	4.91	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	184/1418	4.82	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	142/1416	4.91	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	574/1199	4.14	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	276/1312	4.64	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	288/1303	4.82	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	111/ 758	4.73	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.73
Laboratory														
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.69	4.40	4.66	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	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	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 689L 0101  
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS  
 Instructor: SHIN, SARAH  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 564  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	416/1504	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	11	4.42	563/1453	4.42	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	410/1421	4.40	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	2	14	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	260/1485	4.70	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	782/1483	4.12	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	587/1425	4.65	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	514/1418	4.55	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	15	4.45	701/1416	4.45	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	568/1199	4.16	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	5	5	7	3.79	887/1312	3.79	4.47	4.00	4.31	3.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	1	4	3	9	3.84	1016/1303	3.84	4.67	4.24	4.58	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	0	3	14	4.35	723/1299	4.35	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	3	2	2	4	0	2.64	729/ 758	2.64	4.28	4.01	4.24	2.64
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.67	4.09	4.56	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors	0 Graduate 11 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 4	General	0 Under-grad 9 Non-major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	Electives	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00 13	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	20

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

Course-Section: EDUC 771 0101  
 Title RESEARCH DESIGNS IN ED  
 Instructor: OLIVA, LINDA M.  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 565  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.33	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	4.25	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	630/ 758	3.33	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 781 8020  
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP  
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 566  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	4.80	4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	4.80	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.85	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	4.65	4.33	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	4.92	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	4.90	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	4.95	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	4.85	4.35	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	4.94	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	4.94	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	4.33	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 781 8720  
 Title TEACHER LEADERSHIP  
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 567  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	549/1504	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	380/1503	4.80	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	331/1453	4.80	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	247/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	169/1365	4.85	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	705/1485	4.65	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	657/1504	4.95	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	108/1483	4.92	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	331/1425	4.90	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	126/1418	4.95	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	407/1416	4.85	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1050/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.94	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	223/1299	4.94	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	535/ 758	4.33	4.28	4.01	4.24	3.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.47	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.51	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	4.48	4.51	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 791P 0101  
 Title PRACT SCHOOL ISD  
 Instructor: MURPHY, JOYCE A  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 568  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.34	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.38	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	150/1485	4.80	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	****	4.50	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1426	****	4.80	4.69	4.80	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1418	****	4.45	4.25	4.36	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	4.07	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.28	4.01	4.24	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	55/ 76	4.60	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.60
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/ 70	4.80	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	34/ 67	4.60	4.32	4.34	4.48	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	28/ 76	4.80	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	32/ 56	4.40	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.40
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	21/ 44	4.80	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.80
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	22/ 47	4.60	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.60
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	21/ 39	4.60	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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



I 0  
? 0

Other

4

Title  
Instructor: SHIN, SARAH  
Enrollment: 6  
Questionnaires: 6

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	3	3	0	3.50	1353/1504	3.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	4.38	4.08	4.35	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	331/1425	4.80	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	738/1426	4.80	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	369/1199	4.40	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.40
-----														
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.28	4.01	4.24	****
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	70/ 76	3.50	4.47	4.61	4.57	3.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.06	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	69/ 76	3.50	4.51	4.44	4.39	3.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.18	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792C 8020  
 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR  
 Instructor: BOYER, SUSAN N  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 570  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792C 8720  
 Title CAPSTONE SEMINAR  
 Instructor: BOYER, SUSAN N  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 571  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	168/1504	4.86	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	85/1503	4.93	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.56	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	127/1421	4.80	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	100/1365	4.86	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	170/1485	4.79	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	409/1483	4.44	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	176/1312	4.79	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.93	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	395/1299	4.71	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	121/ 758	4.69	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.69
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	38/ 76	4.86	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.86
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	19/ 70	4.93	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.93
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	21/ 67	4.93	4.32	4.34	4.48	4.93
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	26/ 76	4.86	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792L 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 572  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1003/1365	3.75	4.38	4.08	4.35	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	572/1425	4.67	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	446/1416	4.67	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.47	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.67	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.72	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.42	4.43	4.31	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 56	4.50	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.77	4.65	4.74	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.57	4.44	4.55	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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: ZONKER, SHIRLEY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 573  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	285/1425	4.33	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	620/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	317/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	380/1416	4.55	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	91/1199	4.59	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/ 233	4.67	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	69/ 244	4.57	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 225	4.83	4.83	4.23	4.69	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 207	4.80	4.80	4.09	4.40	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	41/ 70	4.57	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.57
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 58	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	24/ 56	4.67	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	28/ 44	4.67	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 47	4.83	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.83
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	25/ 40	4.71	4.26	4.53	4.37	4.71

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/	35	4.83	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	24/	36	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.71
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	13/	20	4.57	3.04	4.24	3.16	4.57
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	9/	16	4.60	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.60

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: ZONKER, SHIRLEY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 573  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 574  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	***/1483	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.33	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.55	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.59	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/ 233	4.67	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	69/ 244	4.57	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 225	4.83	4.83	4.23	4.69	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 207	4.80	4.80	4.09	4.40	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	41/ 70	4.57	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.57
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 58	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	24/ 56	4.67	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	28/ 44	4.67	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 47	4.83	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.83
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	25/ 40	4.71	4.26	4.53	4.37	4.71

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/	35	4.83	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	24/	36	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.71
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	13/	20	4.57	3.04	4.24	3.16	4.57
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	9/	16	4.60	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.60

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 574  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 575  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	***/1483	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1308/1425	4.33	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1319/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.55	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.59	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/ 233	4.67	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	69/ 244	4.57	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 225	4.83	4.83	4.23	4.69	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 207	4.80	4.80	4.09	4.40	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	41/ 70	4.57	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.57
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 58	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	24/ 56	4.67	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	28/ 44	4.67	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 47	4.83	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.83
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	25/ 40	4.71	4.26	4.53	4.37	4.71

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/	35	4.83	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	24/	36	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.71
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	13/	20	4.57	3.04	4.24	3.16	4.57
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	9/	16	4.60	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.60

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 575  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 576  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1453	4.86	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	245/1365	4.57	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1221/1504	4.33	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	***/1483	4.40	4.18	4.06	4.20	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	784/1425	4.33	4.50	4.41	4.51	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1128/1426	4.46	4.80	4.69	4.80	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	578/1418	4.43	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.55	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.59	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	137/1312	4.86	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	253/1299	4.86	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	73/ 758	4.86	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	47/ 233	4.67	4.67	4.09	4.56	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	69/ 244	4.57	4.55	4.09	4.09	4.57
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	82/ 227	4.67	4.69	4.40	4.66	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	46/ 225	4.83	4.83	4.23	4.69	4.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	29/ 207	4.80	4.80	4.09	4.40	4.80
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.47	4.61	4.57	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	41/ 70	4.57	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.57
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.51	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	19/ 73	4.86	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.86
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	29/ 58	4.83	4.42	4.43	4.31	4.83
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	24/ 56	4.67	4.29	4.23	4.26	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	28/ 44	4.67	4.77	4.65	4.74	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	15/ 47	4.83	4.38	4.29	4.41	4.83
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	17/ 39	4.67	4.57	4.44	4.55	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	25/ 40	4.71	4.26	4.53	4.37	4.71

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/	35	4.83	4.30	4.49	4.46	4.83
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	24/	36	4.71	4.69	4.60	4.75	4.71
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	13/	20	4.57	3.04	4.24	3.16	4.57
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	9/	16	4.60	4.48	4.51	4.40	4.60



Course-Section: EDUC 792U 0101  
 Title ISD INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 576  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 794 0101  
 Title ISD PROJECT SEMINAR  
 Instructor: KINERNEY, DONNA  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 577  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	937/1503	4.17	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	711/1290	4.33	4.56	4.28	4.36	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1128/1485	3.83	4.33	4.16	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.18	4.06	4.20	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.50	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.80	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1416	4.40	4.35	4.26	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	636/1199	4.00	4.07	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	4.47	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.67	4.24	4.58	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.72	4.25	4.56	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	154/ 758	4.60	4.28	4.01	4.24	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.06	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	34/ 67	4.60	4.32	4.34	4.48	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	44/ 76	4.60	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	28/ 73	4.60	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.60

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

Course-Section: EDUC 795 0101  
 Title SEM STUDY TEACHING  
 Instructor: SCHAFFER, EUGEN  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 578  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.34	4.20	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.43	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.31	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	493/1365	4.33	4.38	4.08	4.35	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.33	4.16	4.24	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.83	4.69	4.79	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.18	4.06	4.20	5.00
-----														
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.47	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 70	4.67	4.06	4.35	4.21	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 76	4.67	4.51	4.44	4.39	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	4.18	4.17	4.15	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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