

Course Section: ENGL 100 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 707  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	8	8	4.50	590/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	412/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	441/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	265/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	249/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	234/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	481/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	170/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	473/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	621/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	380/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	3	1	0	0	2	2.50	1227/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	340/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	632/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	923/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 6	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 13
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 7	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 708  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	5	9	1	3.25	1563/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	6	5	3.75	1334/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	969/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	7	5	3.70	1279/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	4	4	3.20	1383/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	3	8	3.80	1101/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	1	4	8	3.58	1365/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	731/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	10	6	1	3.26	1452/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1277/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	1231/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	932/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1025/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1305/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	2	3	0	3	3.22	1374/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	865/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	1	3	0	2	3.14	908/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 2	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SAWYERS, SETH A  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 709  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	914/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	412/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	773/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	673/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	1062/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	180/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	14	4.69	281/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	1049/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	666/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	505/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	650/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	386/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	744/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	846/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	422/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	427/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	368/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	271/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.45	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 710  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	4	4.08	1124/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	814/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	717/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	453/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	608/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	885/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1394/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	1052/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	986/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	621/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	926/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	531/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	1231/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	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	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100 0501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 711  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	889/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	332/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	392/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	424/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	5	7	3.89	947/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	195/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.74	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	458/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	220/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	113/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	307/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	243/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	623/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	812/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	558/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	2	0	1	9	4.15	944/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	500/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	199/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 6	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 1	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	2	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 6	
			? 3		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 714  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	549/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	496/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	340/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	115/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	128/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1132/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1022/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	705/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	959/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	587/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1036/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	880/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	920/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	479/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
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	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 715  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	5	5	4	3.47	1493/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	1065/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1029/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	2	7	3.47	1249/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	11	4.29	618/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	3	4	6	3.81	1241/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	6	8	2	3.65	1630/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	3.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	538/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	1022/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	594/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	438/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	965/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	4	6	4	3.53	929/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	749/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	595/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	467/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	666/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 6	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 2	
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 716  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1320/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	472/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1222/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	424/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	533/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	390/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	828/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1620/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	3.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	810/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1022/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1193/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	800/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1069/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	632/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	920/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: ENGL 100 0901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 718  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	793/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	676/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	539/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	277/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	218/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	161/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	713/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	1082/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	1055/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	637/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	980/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	340/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	486/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	235/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 16
84-150	1	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 4	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 1001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 719  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	2	8	4	3	3.10	1589/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	9	5	3.85	1273/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1061/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	3	7	3.45	1398/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	3	5	4	3.05	1420/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	8	3	6	3.50	1260/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	4	4	8	3.84	1214/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	2	1	2	10	1	3.44	1387/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	3	9	5	3.70	1341/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	2	2	14	4.30	1319/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	9	4	3.70	1261/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	6	4	5	3.35	1357/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	2	6	3	2	2.82	1392/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	2.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	2	7	1	5	3.29	1367/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	4	3	7	3.71	1214/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	2	4	2	2	1	2.64	964/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	2.64	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	206/ 226	3.20	4.20	4.20	3.98	3.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	178/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	3.80	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	220/ 225	3.40	4.38	4.50	4.42	3.40	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100 1001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 719  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100 1101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 720  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	951/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	281/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	632/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	382/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	301/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	250/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	697/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	939/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	423/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	727/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	358/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	300/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	273/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	232/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	358/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	224/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	2	0	2	4	2	3.40	810/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	11
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100 1201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 721  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	6	2	2	3.14	1583/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1273/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	2	3.64	1174/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	1140/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	3	4	3.21	1378/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	2	4	3.43	1294/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	2	4	3.36	1464/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1492/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	7	5	1	3.36	1420/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	1003/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	825/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1220/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1258/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1057/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	849/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	4	2	3	2	3.08	1392/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	1018/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	841/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6



Course Section: ENGL 100 1401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 722  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	8	9	4.05	1145/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	399/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	18	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	13	4.55	455/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	389/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	234/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	566/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	788/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	10	9	4.30	631/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	2	0	0	3	10	4.27	1076/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	973/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	451/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	534/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	10	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	1.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	170/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	4	15	4.55	595/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	419/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 3	A 7	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 11		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 0	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100 1501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 725  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	511/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	149/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	146/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	285/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	1017/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1144/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	423/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	113/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	76/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	115/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	519/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	141/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	926/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	344/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	3.20	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	3.40	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	



Course Section: ENGL 100 1501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WILKINSON, RACH (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 725  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	13						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENGL 100 1601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 727  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	7	2	3.53	1471/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	8	8	4.29	827/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	946/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	6	3	3.29	1340/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	819/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	2	9	3.94	1113/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	2	4.06	1503/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	10	4	4.00	918/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	939/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	862/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	702/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	926/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	731/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	692/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	613/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	309/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	862/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100 1601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 727  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 2	A 7	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		



Course Section: ENGL 100 1701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 731  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	478/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	134/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	136/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	323/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	492/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	298/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	446/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	666/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	473/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	621/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	471/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	5	5	4.07	552/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	512/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	256/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	532/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	862/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100 1801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 732  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	7	5	3	3.56	1454/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1059/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	916/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	875/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	3	3.44	1280/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	857/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1310/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	1	4.07	1492/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	6	9	0	3.60	1312/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	10	3	3.88	1281/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	760/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	753/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	965/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	2	6	0	3	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	7	2	3.67	1088/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	754/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	657/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	3	2	7	3	3.67	694/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 226	3.20	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100 1901  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 733  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	1103/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	814/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	496/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	516/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	465/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	955/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	965/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	800/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	799/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	307/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	556/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	770/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	3	2	2	0	2.86	1173/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	445/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	754/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	434/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	1	0	9	3	2	3.33	841/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	7	A	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
-----					
			Required for Majors	15	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	20
			Other	5	Major
					Non-major
					19
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course Section: ENGL 100 2001  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 734  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	988/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	9	4.30	814/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	641/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	438/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	465/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	5	8	3.90	1161/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	13	6	4.25	690/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	679/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	512/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	777/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	547/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	890/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	340/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	427/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	168/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	364/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.29	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	16	0.00-0.99 4	A 4	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		



Course Section: ENGL 100 2101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 738  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	8	4	3.57	1449/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	9	4	3.62	1424/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	773/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	5	7	5	3.74	1262/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	8	3	6	3.55	1202/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	8	7	3.90	1019/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	1	3	4	8	3.55	1373/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	901/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	4	2	8	1	3.40	1400/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1389/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	2	0	3	1	3.50	1330/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	****/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	7	1	1	1	0	1.60	1287/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	1.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	4	0	2	1	2.75	1450/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
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 5	
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100 2201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 742  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	7	1	3.50	1480/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	9	2	3.79	1320/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1072/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	922/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	4	3.79	1037/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	562/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1043/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	2	4.14	1451/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	8	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	5	7	1	3.50	1389/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1354/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.21	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	7	3	3.79	1220/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	7	2	3.50	1319/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	6	1	3.38	1220/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1154/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1294/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	914/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.13	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	3.40	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100 2201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 742  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100 2301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 744  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	9	7	2	3.53	1471/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	10	4	3.79	1320/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	4	5	3.58	1198/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	911/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	3	6	3	3.11	1413/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	4	9	4.00	895/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	5	7	3.83	1223/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1345/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	9	1	3.59	1321/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	8	3	3.82	1299/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	843/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	1005/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	4	3.94	1132/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	2	2	1	1	1	2.57	1217/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1029/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	4	1	11	4.24	893/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	718/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	2	11	3	3.94	555/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.94	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	3	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 226	3.20	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 225	3.40	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	68/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100 2301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 744  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 8	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	0	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 3	
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100 2401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 747  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	13	5	3.95	1230/1669	3.90	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	591/1666	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	847/1421	4.24	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	739/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	8	8	3.91	939/1555	3.90	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	10	4.18	735/1543	4.35	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	334/1647	4.09	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	3	4.14	1457/1668	4.54	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	779/1605	3.98	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	553/1514	4.32	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	512/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	360/1503	4.35	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	446/1506	4.27	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	6	4	8	4	3.45	967/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	709/1490	4.27	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	950/1502	4.16	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	622/1489	4.63	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	3	3	5	4	3.50	759/1006	3.84	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	3.80	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	3.80	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	Under-grad 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Non-major 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	5
?	0		

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 748  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	389/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	164/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	302/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	591/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	408/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	438/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	587/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	336/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	199/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: ENGL 100A 0102  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 750  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	318/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	285/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	123/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	828/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	587/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	436/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 753  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	5	3	0	2.92	1614/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	2.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	5	3	3.67	1387/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	863/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	5	2	3.33	1326/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	844/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	6	2	3.58	1361/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1382/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	1293/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	7	2	3.82	1303/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	1364/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1066/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	2	4	3.82	1219/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1107/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1135/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	1398/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	841/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 1	A 3	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0202  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 754  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1332/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	984/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	466/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	801/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	584/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	390/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	839/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	1438/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1108/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1341/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	1361/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	6	2	3.80	1210/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	0	4	3	3.70	1262/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1178/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	979/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1285/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1310/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 755  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1550/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1466/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	969/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	2	4	3.60	1334/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	0	3	3	3.44	1272/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1260/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	992/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1501/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	1152/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	905/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1010/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	0	2	3	3.22	1278/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	3	0	4	3.44	1323/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	1	1	5	3.78	1181/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0302  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 756  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1222/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	492/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	895/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	918/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	264/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	849/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1223/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	694/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	140/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	3.99	4.38	4.04	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	3.79	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	3.94	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	3.97	3.95	3.90	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.00	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.17	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.08	4.31	4.08	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.19	4.45	4.26	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.08	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 29	5.00	4.15	4.34	4.22	5.00	

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0302  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 756  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 759  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1110/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	505/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	280/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	975/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1021/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	838/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	435/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1382/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	1070/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	936/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	519/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1219/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	3	1	1	5	3.55	919/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	965/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	1	1	4	3.67	1253/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	3	1	4	3.78	1181/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	694/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0402  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 760  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	590/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	243/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	171/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	918/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	277/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	587/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	622/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	344/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	3.99	4.38	4.04	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: ENGL 100A 0501  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 763  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1235/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1308/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	863/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	715/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	608/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	839/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1594/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	3.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	373/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	679/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	788/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	464/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	868/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	622/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1117/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	640/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	862/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.29	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0601  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 766  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	8	2	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1042/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	886/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	875/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	3	3	3.55	1207/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1210/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	435/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	335/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1174/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1231/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	765/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	809/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	3	1	3	2	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	956/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	978/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	909/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	694/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
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	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0602  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 768  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1042/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1189/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1087/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	353/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	270/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	690/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	993/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	936/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	765/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	892/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	0	5	3	3.70	818/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	812/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1013/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	1015/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	632/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.83	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0701  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 769  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1307/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	634/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1100/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1029/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1045/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	282/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	481/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	769/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	918/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1082/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1028/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	556/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1010/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	970/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	1253/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	684/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	5	2	3.88	617/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0702  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 771  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1026/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	984/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	746/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	899/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1227/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	390/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1149/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	1068/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	725/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	993/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	1231/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.06	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1168/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	0	4	3.60	1300/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1069/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1225/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	893/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	4	2	2	3.18	896/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.18	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 773  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1409/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	777/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1205/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1179/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	1045/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1035/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	1	2	3.44	1421/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1412/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	3.89	1277/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	843/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	3.67	1277/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1285/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	1.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1036/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	632/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	574/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	891/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 226	4.50	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	5.00	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	5.00	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	5.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	5.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	5.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	5.00	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	5.00	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	5.00	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	5.00	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0801  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 773  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 1	A 0	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 9 Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100A 0802  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 774  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.10	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	814/1666	4.34	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	701/1421	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	496/1617	4.36	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1111/1555	4.08	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	440/1543	4.37	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.46	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1214/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.44	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	857/1605	4.02	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	939/1514	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1069/1551	4.43	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	702/1503	4.38	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	809/1506	4.26	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	3	1	4	1	1	2.60	1213/1311	3.08	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	849/1490	4.13	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	0	9	4.38	772/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	657/1489	4.38	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	729/1006	3.78	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.60	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		



Course Section: ENGL 100C 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 776  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	1253/1669	3.94	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	483/1666	4.56	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.75	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	242/1617	4.73	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1118/1555	3.69	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	1	10	4.31	790/1647	4.31	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1464/1668	4.13	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	647/1514	4.63	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	1000/1551	4.20	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	12	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	1	7	5	3.87	725/1311	3.87	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	945/1490	3.92	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	613/1489	4.58	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	6	2	1	3.20	891/1006	3.20	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ENGL 100C 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 776  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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	5				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENGL 100H 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 778  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	183/1669	4.83	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	461/1666	4.58	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	496/1617	4.50	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	4	1	3.17	1395/1555	3.17	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1300/1647	3.70	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	127/1605	4.83	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	438/1503	4.63	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	521/1506	4.63	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.20	4.05	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	110/1006	4.86	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	4		
				? 0				

Course Section: ENGL 100P 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 779  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	1	7	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	3	6	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1421	****	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	2	6	3.86	1196/1617	3.86	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	5	3.80	1021/1555	3.80	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	723/1543	4.20	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	5	2	3	2.93	1541/1647	2.93	4.02	4.12	4.06	2.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.93	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1172/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	4	5	3.87	1284/1514	4.43	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	1361/1551	4.35	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	2	6	3.80	1210/1503	4.15	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	1142/1506	4.47	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	4	5	4	1	3.14	1091/1311	2.87	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	859/1502	4.29	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	1020/1489	4.07	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	677/1006	3.69	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.69	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
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	14				
				?	2						

Course Section: ENGL 100Y 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 781  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	0	2	0	5	6	5	3.67	1409/1669	3.79	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	3	1	7	3	5	3.32	1531/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	14	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1421	4.07	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	1	3	2	6	5	3.65	1312/1617	3.92	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	5	6	4	3.50	1227/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	819/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	7	5	2	3	1	2.22	1610/1647	3.23	4.02	4.12	4.06	2.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	4.62	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	6	3	4	2	3.00	1501/1605	3.82	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	3	4	2	5	2	2.94	1468/1514	4.04	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	2	13	4.53	1176/1551	4.47	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.51	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	4	2	5	3	3.19	1404/1503	3.94	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.12	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	4	3	4	2	2.88	1424/1506	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	9	1	2	2	1	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.71	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	2	2	0	4	3.00	1328/1490	3.63	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	2	0	7	4.00	1013/1502	3.99	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	837/1489	4.09	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	3	0	1	3	3	3.30	855/1006	3.41	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.30	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	56/ 112	3.69	3.99	4.38	4.04	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	1	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	61/ 97	4.06	4.13	4.36	4.19	4.22	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	56/ 92	3.44	3.95	4.22	3.79	4.22	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	69/ 105	3.33	3.86	4.20	3.94	4.10	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	39/ 98	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.90	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course Section: ENGL 100Y 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 784  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	4	7	6	4.12	1090/1669	3.79	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	1028/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1421	4.07	4.29	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	370/1617	3.92	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	5	5	4	3.59	1187/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	218/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	4	2	8	3.94	1125/1647	3.23	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.62	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	3	7	1	3.82	1164/1605	3.82	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	955/1514	4.04	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	1168/1551	4.47	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	800/1503	3.94	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	958/1506	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	10	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	1115/1311	2.71	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	742/1490	3.63	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	0	0	2	7	3.83	1160/1502	3.99	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	596/1489	4.09	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	459/1006	3.41	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.10	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 112	3.69	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	4.06	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 92	3.44	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 105	3.33	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 98	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 17
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 100Y 0301  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 785  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1173/1669	3.79	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	10	7	4.21	935/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1421	4.07	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	8	10	4.42	612/1617	3.92	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	709/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	325/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	12	4.40	651/1647	3.23	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	1	4.05	1503/1668	4.62	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	163/1605	3.82	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	739/1514	4.04	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	512/1551	4.47	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	510/1503	3.94	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	594/1506	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	4	3	7	3.61	882/1311	2.71	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	214/1490	3.63	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	495/1502	3.99	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	280/1489	4.09	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	7	4	2	3.50	759/1006	3.41	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	3	0	2	4	1	3.00	98/ 112	3.69	3.99	4.38	4.04	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	65/ 97	4.06	4.13	4.36	4.19	4.10	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	1	4	1	2.80	86/ 92	3.44	3.95	4.22	3.79	2.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	4	0	1	5	0	2.70	98/ 105	3.33	3.86	4.20	3.94	2.70	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	66/ 98	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.90	3.90	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	12	0.00-0.99 11	A 5	Required for Majors	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 100Y 0401  
 Title COMPOSITION  
 Instructor: SIMON, BARBARA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 787  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	3	5	4	3.60	1437/1669	3.79	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	8	4	3.87	1265/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1135/1421	4.07	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1393/1617	3.92	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	2	4	3	1	2.92	1465/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	2.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1152/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	4	2	4	3.20	1504/1647	3.23	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1223/1668	4.62	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1293/1605	3.82	4.10	4.07	3.96	3.26
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	2	6	3	3.33	1418/1514	4.04	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	5	5	3.73	1469/1551	4.47	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.17
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	1	7	4	1	3.07	1419/1503	3.94	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	3	5	3.60	1300/1506	3.85	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	7	1	2	1	2	2.23	1261/1311	2.71	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1311/1490	3.63	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1346/1502	3.99	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	1459/1489	4.09	4.49	4.29	4.07	2.63
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	914/1006	3.41	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	2	2	4	4	1	3.00	98/ 112	3.69	3.99	4.38	4.04	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	1	0	5	2	5	3.77	83/ 97	4.06	4.13	4.36	4.19	3.77
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	84/ 92	3.44	3.95	4.22	3.79	2.92
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	1	4	1	2	2.82	97/ 105	3.33	3.86	4.20	3.94	2.82
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	3	3	3	2	1	2.58	86/ 98	3.70	3.97	3.95	3.90	2.58

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: ENGL 110 0101  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 789  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1409/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1387/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	969/1421	3.94	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1301/1617	3.98	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1427/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1195/1543	3.91	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1043/1647	3.80	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1530/1668	4.58	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1274/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1352/1514	4.10	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	3.89	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1277/1503	4.03	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1277/1506	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.17	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1115/1311	2.32	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.56	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1395/1502	3.45	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	865/1489	3.95	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	694/1006	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 110 0102  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 792  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1563/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.02	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1417/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	969/1421	3.94	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1184/1617	3.98	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	7	0	1	3.25	1359/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1260/1543	3.91	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1187/1647	3.80	4.02	4.12	4.06	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1297/1668	4.58	4.49	4.67	4.62	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1324/1514	4.10	4.30	4.39	4.32	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	1338/1551	3.89	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1330/1503	4.03	4.25	4.24	4.17	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1069/1506	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	939/1311	2.32	3.26	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1107/1490	3.56	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	4	1	1	2.88	1428/1502	3.45	4.28	4.26	4.06	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1137/1489	3.95	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	823/1006	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.81	3.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	212/ 226	3.86	4.20	4.20	3.98	3.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	193/ 233	3.81	4.40	4.19	4.09	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	215/ 225	3.81	4.38	4.50	4.42	3.67	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	193/ 223	3.81	4.44	4.35	4.19	3.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	189/ 206	3.43	4.27	4.15	4.01	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	109/ 112	3.14	3.99	4.38	4.04	2.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	88/ 97	3.57	4.13	4.36	4.19	3.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	73/ 92	3.71	3.95	4.22	3.79	3.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	88/ 105	3.57	3.86	4.20	3.94	3.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	79/ 98	3.57	3.97	3.95	3.90	3.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	46/ 58	4.14	4.60	4.22	4.00	3.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	42/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	3.25	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	35/ 39	4.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	3.25	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	29/ 40	4.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	3.25	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	27/ 30	4.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	3.25	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	50/ 55	3.57	4.19	4.34	4.17	3.25	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	36/ 42	3.43	4.08	4.31	4.08	3.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	42/ 46	3.57	4.19	4.45	4.26	3.25	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	28/ 33	3.43	4.08	4.25	4.25	3.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	27/ 29	3.57	4.15	4.34	4.22	3.25	

Course Section: ENGL 110 0102  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: HUTZLER, ROSEMA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 792  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 110 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 796  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	511/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.11	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	3.94	4.29	4.24	4.11	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1617	3.98	4.25	4.15	3.99	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	418/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	123/1543	3.91	4.31	4.06	3.86	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	401/1647	3.80	4.02	4.12	4.06	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	4.58	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	505/1514	4.10	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	3.89	4.52	4.66	4.55	3.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	323/1503	4.03	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	407/1506	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1057/1311	2.32	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	389/1490	3.56	4.20	4.05	3.85	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	540/1502	3.45	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	596/1489	3.95	4.49	4.29	4.07	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	235/1006	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.81	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	3.86	4.20	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	3.81	4.40	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	3.81	4.38	4.50	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	3.43	4.27	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	3.14	3.99	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	3.57	4.13	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	3.71	3.95	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	3.57	3.86	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	3.57	3.97	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	4.14	4.60	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	4.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	4.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	4.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	3.57	4.19	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	3.43	4.08	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	3.57	4.19	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	3.43	4.08	4.25	4.25	****	

Course Section: ENGL 110 0201  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 796  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 110 0202  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 799  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	914/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.02	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1387/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1357/1421	3.94	4.29	4.24	4.11	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1251/1617	3.98	4.25	4.15	3.99	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	1227/1555	3.52	3.96	4.00	3.92	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1138/1543	3.91	4.31	4.06	3.86	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1560/1647	3.80	4.02	4.12	4.06	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	4.58	4.49	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	918/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1082/1514	4.10	4.30	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1338/1551	3.89	4.52	4.66	4.55	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	879/1503	4.03	4.25	4.24	4.17	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	642/1506	4.22	4.22	4.26	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1027/1311	2.32	3.26	3.85	3.68	2.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.56	4.20	4.05	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1301/1502	3.45	4.28	4.26	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1398/1489	3.95	4.49	4.29	4.07	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	967/1006	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.81	2.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	3.86	4.20	4.20	3.98	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	146/ 233	3.81	4.40	4.19	4.09	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	187/ 225	3.81	4.38	4.50	4.42	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	164/ 223	3.81	4.44	4.35	4.19	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	117/ 206	3.43	4.27	4.15	4.01	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	81/ 112	3.14	3.99	4.38	4.04	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 97	3.57	4.13	4.36	4.19	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	63/ 92	3.71	3.95	4.22	3.79	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	72/ 105	3.57	3.86	4.20	3.94	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	46/ 98	3.57	3.97	3.95	3.90	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 58	4.14	4.60	4.22	4.00	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	4.00	4.19	4.06	3.81	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	4.00	4.29	4.39	4.30	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	4.00	4.17	3.97	4.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	4.00	4.42	4.33	4.30	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 55	3.57	4.19	4.34	4.17	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 42	3.43	4.08	4.31	4.08	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	31/ 46	3.57	4.19	4.45	4.26	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	19/ 33	3.43	4.08	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	17/ 29	3.57	4.15	4.34	4.22	4.00	

Course Section: ENGL 110 0202  
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 799  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 210 0101  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, VI  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 802  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	7	15	4.37	769/1669	4.24	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	412/1666	4.55	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	293/1421	4.61	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	18	4.44	583/1617	4.42	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	136/1555	4.71	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	4	17	4.38	534/1543	4.36	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	4	19	4.41	651/1647	4.52	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1668	4.56	4.49	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	11	8	4.13	820/1605	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	223/1514	4.71	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	205/1551	4.82	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	289/1503	4.56	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	225/1506	4.71	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	4	2	3	7	6	3.41	995/1311	3.41	3.26	3.85	3.96	3.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	433/1490	4.41	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	741/1502	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	368/1489	4.76	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	1	0	2	6	4.10	459/1006	4.10	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.10	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	5
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 16		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17





Course Section: ENGL 210 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: KENDALL, GEORGE  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 803  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	20	15	4.11	1090/1669	4.24	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	9	28	4.47	605/1666	4.55	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	9	28	4.48	594/1421	4.61	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	5	15	21	4.39	651/1617	4.42	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	31	4.61	255/1555	4.71	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	4	13	23	4.33	580/1543	4.36	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	33	4.64	334/1647	4.52	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	39	5	4.11	1470/1668	4.56	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	23	13	4.29	654/1605	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	13	24	4.53	775/1514	4.71	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	9	29	4.68	1014/1551	4.82	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	5	11	22	4.38	742/1503	4.56	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	10	27	4.57	575/1506	4.71	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	32	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	****/1311	3.41	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	658/1490	4.41	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	0	2	2	13	4.44	705/1502	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	490/1489	4.76	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	12	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	****/1006	4.10	3.89	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.71	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.59	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: ENGL 210 0201  
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT  
 Instructor: KENDALL, GEORGE  
 Enrollment: 51  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 803  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	31	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	44	Non-major	44
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	2						

Course Section: ENGL 226 0101  
 Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 804  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	3	6	8	4	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	12	3	3.68	1372/1666	3.68	4.17	4.19	4.29	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	6	11	4.18	871/1421	4.18	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	6	5	5	3.67	1301/1617	3.67	4.25	4.15	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	7	5	6	3.45	1265/1555	3.45	3.96	4.00	3.96	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	6	6	3.50	1260/1543	3.50	4.31	4.06	4.10	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	2	3	5	4	5	3.37	1459/1647	3.37	4.02	4.12	4.19	3.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	2	11	7	1	3.23	1649/1668	3.23	4.49	4.67	4.59	3.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	7	5	0	3.07	1498/1605	3.07	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	1	7	7	2	3.20	1438/1514	3.20	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	1377/1551	4.14	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	0	6	5	5	3.61	1297/1503	3.61	4.25	4.24	4.29	3.61	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	4	7	6	3.62	1296/1506	3.62	4.22	4.26	4.33	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	12	3	1	3	0	1	2.38	1248/1311	2.38	3.26	3.85	3.96	2.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	0	5	2	5	3.40	1215/1490	3.40	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	818/1502	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	4	1	8	3.93	1098/1489	3.93	4.49	4.29	4.36	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	2	2	1	0	3	3.00	923/1006	3.00	3.89	4.00	3.99	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	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 6	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 23	Non-major 17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 8		
				? 1			

Course Section: ENGL 241 0101  
 Title CURRENTS IN BRITISH LI  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 805  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	3	2	8	7	6	3.42	1516/1669	3.42	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	5	10	5	3.46	1484/1666	3.46	4.17	4.19	4.29	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	3	6	12	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	9	10	3.81	1224/1617	3.81	4.25	4.15	4.24	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	9	12	4.20	611/1555	4.20	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	6	6	7	3.58	1232/1543	3.58	4.31	4.06	4.10	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	8	6	7	3.64	1331/1647	3.64	4.02	4.12	4.19	3.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	23	1	4.00	1530/1668	4.00	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	7	10	0	3.30	1441/1605	3.30	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	10	8	3.88	1277/1514	3.88	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	4	5	15	4.36	1289/1551	4.36	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	7	6	9	3.80	1210/1503	3.80	4.25	4.24	4.29	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	8	11	4.04	1051/1506	4.04	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	2	4	4	8	3.57	1128/1490	3.57	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	5	2	3	10	3.76	1202/1502	3.76	4.28	4.26	4.31	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	5	1	4	11	4.00	1038/1489	4.00	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	19	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	15
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	B 18		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 25
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 243A 0101  
 Title LITERATURE OF WAR  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 806  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	0	7	3	3.62	1432/1669	3.62	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	4	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	7	3	3.92	1051/1421	3.92	4.29	4.24	4.35	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	5	3.93	1140/1617	3.93	4.25	4.15	4.24	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	207/1555	4.69	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	9	2	3.77	1130/1543	3.77	4.31	4.06	4.10	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	948/1647	4.17	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1039/1668	4.69	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	8	2	3.69	1255/1605	3.69	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	6	3	3.69	1343/1514	3.69	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1223/1551	4.46	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	7	3	3.85	1193/1503	3.85	4.25	4.24	4.29	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	5	4	3.69	1265/1506	3.69	4.22	4.26	4.33	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	818/1311	3.70	3.26	3.85	3.96	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	0	3	5	3.73	1055/1490	3.73	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	978/1502	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	909/1489	4.27	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 6	Under-grad 14 Non-major 13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
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 2	
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 243B 0101  
 Title COMIC BOOK LITERATURE  
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 807  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	306/1669	4.73	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	7	22	4.55	505/1666	4.55	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	210/1421	4.82	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	382/1617	4.61	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	26	4.75	171/1555	4.75	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	2	25	4.68	242/1543	4.68	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	9	23	4.72	250/1647	4.72	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	1	1	12	11	6	3.65	1630/1668	3.65	4.49	4.67	4.59	3.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	8	18	4.52	787/1514	4.52	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	205/1551	4.97	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	9	20	4.69	360/1503	4.69	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	261/1506	4.83	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	1	0	2	5	10	4.28	432/1311	4.28	3.26	3.85	3.96	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	242/1490	4.78	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	358/1502	4.79	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	456/1489	4.74	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	614/1006	3.89	3.89	4.00	3.99	3.89	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	34	Non-major	27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 243H 0101  
 Title LITERATURE OF WAR  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 808  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.04	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.17	4.19	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.29	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.25	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.96	4.00	3.96	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.31	4.06	4.10	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.02	4.12	4.19	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.10	4.07	4.15	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.30	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.25	4.24	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.22	4.26	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.26	3.85	3.96	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	3.99	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 226	5.00	4.20	4.20	4.42	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.40	4.19	4.36	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.38	4.50	4.74	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 223	5.00	4.44	4.35	4.71	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 206	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.59	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	3.99	4.38	4.59	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.13	4.36	4.60	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	3.95	4.22	4.50	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	3.86	4.20	4.63	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	3.97	3.95	4.20	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	4.60	4.22	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.19	4.06	5.00	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.29	4.39	5.00	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.17	3.97	5.00	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.42	4.33	5.00	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 55	5.00	4.19	4.34	4.67	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.08	4.31	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 46	5.00	4.19	4.45	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.08	4.25	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 29	5.00	4.15	4.34	5.00	5.00	



Course Section: ENGL 243H 0101  
 Title LITERATURE OF WAR  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 808  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 250 0101  
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE  
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 810  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	143/1669	4.88	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	181/1666	4.81	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	19	4.54	465/1617	4.54	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	80/1555	4.92	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	21	4.65	258/1543	4.65	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	5	17	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	825/1668	4.85	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	0	8	11	4.40	499/1605	4.40	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	151/1514	4.92	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	220/1503	4.81	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	188/1506	4.88	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	3	1	4	2	8	3.61	882/1311	3.61	3.26	3.85	3.96	3.61	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	279/1490	4.74	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.74	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	246/1502	4.89	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	456/1489	4.74	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	192/1006	4.63	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 17	Graduate	0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 271 0101  
 Title INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 811  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	727/1666	4.38	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	7	4.78	255/1421	4.78	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.78		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	4	15	4.42	626/1617	4.42	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	10	10	4.22	592/1555	4.22	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	21	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	1289/1668	4.38	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	525/1605	4.38	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	788/1551	4.80	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	653/1503	4.45	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	718/1506	4.45	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	17	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	3	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	299/1006	4.42	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	24	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 273 0101  
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 812  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1480/1669	4.02	4.04	4.23	4.34	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1578/1666	3.73	4.17	4.19	4.29	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1372/1617	4.04	4.25	4.15	4.24	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	2.00	1545/1555	3.10	3.96	4.00	3.96	2.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	895/1543	4.43	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1586/1647	3.48	4.02	4.12	4.19	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1651/1668	3.92	4.49	4.67	4.59	3.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1428/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.15	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	0	1	1	3.00	1457/1514	3.89	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1111/1551	4.80	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1477/1503	3.59	4.25	4.24	4.29	2.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1470/1506	3.53	4.22	4.26	4.33	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1328/1490	3.81	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1475/1502	3.75	4.28	4.26	4.31	2.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1279/1489	4.13	4.49	4.29	4.36	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	4.80	3.89	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 273 0201  
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR  
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 813  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	556/1669	4.02	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	605/1666	3.73	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.86	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	424/1617	4.04	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	611/1555	3.10	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	119/1543	4.43	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	549/1647	3.48	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1068/1668	3.92	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	239/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	408/1514	3.89	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	4.80	4.52	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	254/1503	3.59	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	471/1506	3.53	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	372/1490	3.81	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1502	3.75	4.28	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	434/1489	4.13	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	123/1006	4.80	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.80	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 15	Non-major 9
84-150	2	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 6		
				? 0			

Course Section: ENGL 291 0101  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 814  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	318/1669	4.36	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1666	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	280/1421	4.25	4.29	4.24	4.35	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	142/1617	4.58	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	418/1555	3.93	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	123/1543	4.64	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	185/1647	4.32	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	926/1668	4.53	4.49	4.67	4.59	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	157/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1514	4.36	4.30	4.39	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1551	4.94	4.52	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1503	4.26	4.25	4.24	4.29	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	286/1506	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	261/1490	4.63	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	306/1502	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	252/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	143/1006	4.70	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.75	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 291 0201  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 815  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	1014/1669	4.36	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	827/1666	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1421	4.25	4.29	4.24	4.35	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	760/1617	4.58	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	1	5	5	3.35	1319/1555	3.93	3.96	4.00	3.96	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	172/1543	4.64	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	5	5	4	3.53	1385/1647	4.32	4.02	4.12	4.19	3.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	4.53	4.49	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	918/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	4	5	3.86	1288/1514	4.36	4.30	4.39	4.39	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	409/1551	4.94	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1030/1503	4.26	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1153/1506	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.33	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	184/1490	4.63	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	189/1502	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	500/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	185/1006	4.70	3.89	4.00	3.99	4.64	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	10

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

Course Section: ENGL 291 0301  
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY  
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 816  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	1001/1669	4.36	4.04	4.23	4.34	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	439/1666	4.63	4.17	4.19	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1135/1421	4.25	4.29	4.24	4.35	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	394/1617	4.58	4.25	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	773/1555	3.93	3.96	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	608/1543	4.64	4.31	4.06	4.10	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	334/1647	4.32	4.02	4.12	4.19	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	8	1	3.82	1605/1668	4.53	4.49	4.67	4.59	3.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	725/1605	4.33	4.10	4.07	4.15	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	1100/1514	4.36	4.30	4.39	4.39	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	567/1551	4.94	4.52	4.66	4.72	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1255/1503	4.26	4.25	4.24	4.29	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1189/1506	4.20	4.22	4.26	4.33	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.96	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	667/1490	4.63	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	567/1502	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.31	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.36	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1006	4.70	3.89	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	4.42	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	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	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						



Course Section: ENGL 301 0101  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 817  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	633/1669	4.43	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	165/1666	4.79	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	502/1421	4.63	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	151/1617	4.76	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	201/1555	4.84	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	266/1543	4.76	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	532/1647	4.48	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	863/1668	4.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	423/1605	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	392/1514	4.88	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1551	4.96	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	243/1503	4.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1506	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	914/1311	4.10	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	298/1490	4.73	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	567/1502	4.81	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	478/1489	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	0	7	4	4.17	424/1006	4.47	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.17	

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 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 301 0201  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: WIEST, AIMEE  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 818  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	1253/1669	4.43	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	359/1666	4.79	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	356/1421	4.63	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	300/1617	4.76	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	112/1555	4.84	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	180/1543	4.76	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	933/1647	4.48	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	499/1668	4.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1057/1605	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	257/1514	4.88	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	622/1551	4.96	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	528/1503	4.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	693/1506	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	333/1311	4.10	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	232/1490	4.73	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	189/1502	4.81	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1489	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	209/1006	4.47	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 301 0301  
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG  
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 819  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	143/1669	4.43	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	118/1666	4.79	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1421	4.63	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	207/1617	4.76	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	60/1555	4.84	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	111/1543	4.76	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	194/1647	4.48	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	1	4.06	1503/1668	4.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	461/1605	4.28	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1514	4.88	4.30	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1551	4.96	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	154/1503	4.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	200/1506	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	389/1311	4.10	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	324/1490	4.73	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	166/1502	4.81	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	196/1489	4.88	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	178/1006	4.47	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 303 0101  
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY  
 Instructor: OLIVER, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 820  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	11	4.29	864/1669	4.29	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	231/1666	4.76	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1421	****	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	347/1617	4.65	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	324/1555	4.53	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	138/1543	4.81	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	481/1647	4.50	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	1358/1668	4.29	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	565/1605	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	243/1503	4.79	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	212/1506	4.87	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	170/1490	4.87	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	276/1502	4.87	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.87	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

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	4	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 6
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

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

Course Section: ENGL 304 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA  
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 821  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	522/1669	4.56	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	634/1666	4.44	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	14	4.44	632/1421	4.44	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	583/1617	4.44	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	147/1555	4.79	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	5	13	4.22	700/1543	4.22	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	6	15	4.46	566/1647	4.46	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	308/1514	4.83	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	205/1551	4.96	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	286/1506	4.80	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	1	5	6	2	3.18	1081/1311	3.18	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	640/1490	4.32	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	543/1489	4.65	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	5	0	5	3	2	2.80	952/1006	2.80	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 20
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 1	B 12		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 2	C 7	General 1	Under-grad 25 Non-major 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 305 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT:RESTOR - ROMA  
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE  
 Enrollment: 40  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 822  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	157/1666	4.83	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	331/1421	4.72	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	184/1617	4.78	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	40/1555	4.96	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	210/1543	4.72	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	412/1647	4.56	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	16	7	4.30	1353/1668	4.30	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	5	17	4.61	298/1605	4.61	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	170/1514	4.92	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	147/1506	4.92	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	19	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	85/1490	4.94	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	1	16	4.63	513/1502	4.63	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	168/1489	4.94	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	

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	1	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	6
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 306 0101  
 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 823  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	8	8	4.20	988/1669	4.20	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	7	7	3.95	1164/1666	3.95	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	3	9	6	4.17	886/1421	4.17	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	626/1617	4.41	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	183/1555	4.74	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	863/1543	4.05	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	5	6	5	3.63	1337/1647	3.63	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	1096/1668	4.63	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	17	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.46	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	17	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1551	****	4.52	4.66	4.70	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	17	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	****/1503	****	4.25	4.24	4.28	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/1506	****	4.22	4.26	4.30	****	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	512/1490	4.44	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	8	8	4.22	900/1502	4.22	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	909/1489	4.28	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	2	2	2	1	1	2.63	965/1006	2.63	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 307 0101  
 Title AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR  
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 824  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	6	17	4.74	293/1669	4.74	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	372/1666	4.65	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	305/1421	4.74	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	434/1617	4.57	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	50/1555	4.95	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	298/1543	4.61	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	20	4.78	185/1647	4.78	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	486/1605	4.41	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	325/1514	4.83	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	622/1551	4.86	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	312/1503	4.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	16	4.59	556/1506	4.59	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	3	4	10	4.16	507/1311	4.16	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	20	4.82	206/1490	4.82	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	595/1502	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	319/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	4	8	7	3.82	639/1006	3.82	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.82	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.15	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	23	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						



Course Section: ENGL 308 0101  
 Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR  
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 825  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	534/1669	4.55	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	2	4	9	14	4.21	949/1666	4.21	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	5	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	520/1421	4.54	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	1	4	6	15	4.35	706/1617	4.35	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	120/1555	4.86	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	3	3	6	15	4.22	690/1543	4.22	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	1	0	2	8	16	4.41	651/1647	4.41	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	16	11	4.41	1274/1668	4.41	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	398/1605	4.48	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	25	4.79	376/1514	4.79	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	27	4.86	622/1551	4.86	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	4	6	17	4.39	730/1503	4.39	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.39	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	2	2	2	22	4.57	575/1506	4.57	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	0	0	4	3	17	4.54	246/1311	4.54	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	4	5	15	4.36	594/1490	4.36	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	5	3	16	4.36	790/1502	4.36	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	666/1489	4.52	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	4	1	7	1	8	3.38	819/1006	3.38	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.38	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	22
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 310 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN POETRY  
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 826  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	516/1666	4.53	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	511/1421	4.56	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	554/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	141/1555	4.80	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	139/1647	4.86	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1274/1668	4.40	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	423/1605	4.46	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	257/1514	4.87	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	220/1503	4.80	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1506	4.73	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	464/1311	4.22	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	428/1490	4.54	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	296/1502	4.85	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	654/1006	3.77	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

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

Course Section: ENGL 320 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN CT  
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 827  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	1	4	10	4.17	1026/1669	4.17	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	5	7	3.78	1325/1666	3.78	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	821/1617	4.24	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	453/1555	4.39	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	298/1543	4.60	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	1	4	10	4.18	940/1647	4.18	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1265/1668	4.41	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	713/1605	4.23	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	2	2	7	3.73	1330/1514	3.73	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	5	0	8	3.93	1142/1506	3.93	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	717/1502	4.44	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	765/1489	4.44	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 324 0101  
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH  
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 828  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	3.75	1371/1669	3.87	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	1417/1666	3.68	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1029/1617	4.02	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	558/1555	4.22	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	659/1543	4.22	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1430/1647	3.62	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1648/1668	3.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	3.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	1199/1514	4.06	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.88	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	3	3.88	1189/1506	3.99	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	939/1311	2.17	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	585/1490	4.47	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	393/1502	4.68	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	309/1489	4.70	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	959/1006	3.18	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course Section: ENGL 324 0201  
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH  
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 830  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	5	10	4.11	1103/1669	3.87	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	1	3	10	3.79	1320/1666	3.68	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1421	4.50	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	4	2	10	4.06	999/1617	4.02	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	655/1555	4.22	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.16	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	9	4.16	771/1543	4.22	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	4	9	4.00	1043/1647	3.62	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	6	4.32	1345/1668	3.61	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	1166/1514	4.06	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	567/1551	4.88	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	3	10	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	3	2	11	4.11	1017/1506	3.99	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	3	0	3	0	0	2.00	1269/1311	2.17	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	356/1490	4.47	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	1	13	4.53	613/1502	4.68	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	3	0	2	12	4.35	846/1489	4.70	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	3	1	4	9	4.12	453/1006	3.18	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.12	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 19 Non-major 5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 5	D 1		
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	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 326 0101  
 Title STRUCTURE OF ENGLISH  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 831  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	419/1669	4.64	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	385/1666	4.64	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	417/1421	4.64	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	750/1617	4.31	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1037/1555	3.79	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	700/1543	4.21	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	617/1647	4.43	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1257/1668	4.43	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	857/1605	4.09	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	537/1514	4.69	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	409/1551	4.92	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	896/1503	4.23	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	433/1506	4.69	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	206/1490	4.82	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	326/1502	4.82	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	368/1489	4.82	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 340 0101  
 Title MAJOR LITERARY TRADITI  
 Instructor: EDINGER, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 832  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	478/1669	4.60	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	691/1666	4.40	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	356/1421	4.70	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	161/1617	4.80	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1555	5.00	3.96	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	164/1543	4.78	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	926/1647	4.20	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	892/1514	4.44	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	653/1503	4.44	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	340/1490	4.67	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	705/1502	4.44	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	123/1006	4.80	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 364 0101  
 Title: PERSP ON WOMEN IN LIT  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 833  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	4	3.64	1418/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	1206/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	797/1421	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1246/1617	4.05	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	592/1555	4.11	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	994/1543	3.97	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	1	3	3.14	1514/1647	3.71	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1406/1668	4.36	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	6	2	2	3.25	1455/1605	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1160/1514	4.01	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	1152/1551	4.44	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	879/1503	3.90	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	1010/1506	3.95	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	667/1490	4.18	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	729/1502	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	1	2	8	3.93	1107/1489	4.23	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	862/1006	3.40	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		



Course Section: ENGL 364 0101  
 Title PERSPECT ON WOMEN IN L  
 Instructor: FERNANDEZ, JEAN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 834  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	1173/1669	3.88	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1192/1666	3.93	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	901/1421	4.19	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	875/1617	4.05	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	5	8	4.06	734/1555	4.11	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	895/1543	3.97	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	2	7	5	4.00	1043/1647	3.71	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1248/1668	4.36	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1074/1605	4.06	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1277/1514	4.01	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	1304/1551	4.44	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	1315/1503	3.90	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1236/1506	3.95	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	786/1490	4.18	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	2	1	11	4.25	880/1502	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	827/1489	4.23	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	779/1006	3.40	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.46	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 2	A 14	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 16 Non-major 8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 371 0101  
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 836  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	306/1669	4.73	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	966/1666	4.18	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1421	4.25	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	253/1617	4.73	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	622/1555	4.18	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	104/1543	4.91	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	334/1647	4.64	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1425/1668	4.18	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	239/1605	4.67	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	647/1514	4.63	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	438/1503	4.63	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	799/1506	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	669/1006	3.71	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 373 0101  
 Title CREATVE WRITING-POETR  
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 837  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1320/1669	3.86	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	770/1617	4.29	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1555	4.43	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	628/1543	4.29	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1205/1647	3.86	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1225/1506	3.80	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	558/1490	4.40	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1502	4.60	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	596/1489	4.60	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	657/1006	3.75	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 379 0101  
 Title PRINS/PRACT IN TECH CO  
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 838  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	0	2	3.38	1532/1669	3.38	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	5	0	3.13	1565/1666	3.13	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1222/1421	3.50	4.29	4.24	4.25	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1464/1617	3.29	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1236/1543	3.57	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1223/1647	3.83	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	4	2	2	0	0	1.75	1667/1668	1.75	4.49	4.67	4.68	1.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.92	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1418/1514	3.33	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1380/1503	3.33	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1209/1506	3.83	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1227/1311	2.50	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	535/1490	4.43	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	424/1006	4.17	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.17	

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	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	8	Non-major	3
84-150	4	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	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 380 0101  
 Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING  
 Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 841  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1313/1669	3.87	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	1059/1666	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	969/1421	4.00	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	641/1617	4.40	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1257/1555	3.47	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	195/1543	4.73	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	7	4.20	926/1647	4.20	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	788/1668	4.87	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1148/1605	3.83	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	763/1514	4.53	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551	4.93	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	719/1503	4.40	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1506	4.73	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	1	0	1	7	3.91	699/1311	3.91	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1073/1490	3.69	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	772/1502	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	422/1489	4.77	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	902/1006	3.17	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course Section: ENGL 387 0101  
 Title Web Content Develop  
 Instructor: Komlodi, A  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 6  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	207/1669	****	4.14	4.23	4.02	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1094/1666	****	3.93	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	466/1421	****	4.00	4.24	4.11	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	161/1617	****	4.02	4.15	3.99	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	141/1555	****	4.12	4.00	3.92	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	142/1543	****	3.98	4.06	3.86	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1440/1647	****	3.81	4.12	4.06	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1125/1668	****	4.72	4.67	4.62	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1357/1605	****	3.90	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	****	4.30	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1111/1551	****	4.63	4.66	4.55	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	719/1503	****	4.15	4.24	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	770/1506	****	4.07	4.26	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	219/1311	****	4.14	3.85	3.68	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1088/1490	****	4.11	4.05	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	****	4.32	4.26	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	532/1489	****	4.23	4.29	4.07	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	****	4.20	4.00	3.81	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 391 0201  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 842  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1480/1669	3.61	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	1484/1666	3.59	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	0	4	4	3.50	1222/1421	3.43	4.29	4.24	4.25	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1168/1617	3.86	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	2	3	1	2.75	1490/1555	3.08	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1130/1543	3.93	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1435/1647	3.65	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1138/1668	4.47	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1490/1605	3.26	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1334/1514	4.09	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	760/1551	4.64	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1250/1503	3.91	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1288/1506	3.92	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1260/1311	2.25	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	1	2	3	3.22	1278/1490	2.97	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	4	0	3	3.33	1357/1502	3.75	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	753/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	

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	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			

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



Course Section: ENGL 391 0401  
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT  
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 843  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1383/1669	3.61	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	3	4	3.73	1348/1666	3.59	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	5	2	3.36	1286/1421	3.43	4.29	4.24	4.25	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1218/1617	3.86	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1303/1555	3.08	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	838/1543	3.93	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1178/1647	3.65	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	1305/1668	4.47	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1400/1605	3.26	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	877/1514	4.09	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	1231/1551	4.64	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	1020/1503	3.91	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	958/1506	3.92	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	2.25	3.26	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	1	0	2.71	1412/1490	2.97	4.20	4.05	4.11	2.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	938/1502	3.75	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1038/1489	4.22	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1006	****	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 11 Non-major 3
84-150	1	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 10	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 392 0201  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 844  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	590/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	549/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1555	4.43	3.96	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	4.75	3.26	3.85	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0301  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 845  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	2	5.00	1/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1555	4.43	3.96	4.00	4.03	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	481/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0401  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 847  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	759/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0501  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 849  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	816/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	777/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	773/1555	4.43	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1068/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1311	4.75	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	340/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0601  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 853  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1094/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	239/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1022/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	800/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	838/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 55	4.50	4.19	4.34	4.03	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 46	4.50	4.19	4.45	4.13	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	19/ 33	4.00	4.08	4.25	3.00	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	17/ 29	4.00	4.15	4.34	4.13	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	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	3	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 392 0701  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 854  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1596/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	1648/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	2.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3.33	1448/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1195/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1619/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1501/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1457/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1423/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1403/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	

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

Course Section: ENGL 392 0801  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 856  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1094/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	496/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1619/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1514	4.22	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1551	4.67	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1066/1503	4.22	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1069/1506	4.39	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1006	5.00	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: ENGL 392 0901  
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING  
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 858  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1173/1669	4.28	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1466/1666	4.09	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	969/1421	4.83	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1301/1617	4.47	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1410/1543	4.67	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1645/1647	3.69	4.02	4.12	4.14	1.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1668	4.82	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1274/1605	4.62	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.67	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	4.91	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	

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 0		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2		

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

Course Section: ENGL 393 0101  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HENDRICKS, TED  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 859  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1359/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	472/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	121/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	207/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	715/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	6	6	4.07	850/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	4.00	1043/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	570/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	1	9	0	3.73	1233/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	861/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	862/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	835/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	1038/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	3	5	1	3.50	939/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1404/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	880/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	920/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 393 0201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HENDRICKS, TED  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 860  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1395/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	1	7	4.00	1094/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	356/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	750/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	6	4.00	773/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	771/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	549/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	4	1	2	3	3.40	1400/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	1094/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	1319/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.31	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	896/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	1069/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	426/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	849/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	567/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	776/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	235/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 0301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HIRSCHHORN, DAN  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 861  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	5	5	4	3.39	1530/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	8	5	3.89	1250/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	1112/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1148/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	747/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	0	4	10	4.18	940/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	1164/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	6	7	2	3.33	1418/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	973/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	7	5	4	3.50	1330/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	4	1	8	3.71	1262/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	846/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.11	1314/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	975/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	936/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 0401  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 862  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	9	0	3.25	1563/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	4	3.75	1334/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1189/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	7	5	3.75	1251/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	2	3	4	0	2.67	1505/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	857/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	1310/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	10	6	0	3.38	1642/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	3.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	4	8	0	3.46	1374/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	9	4	3.94	1248/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	1384/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	996/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	7	5	3.81	1219/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	439/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	1328/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1434/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1462/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	2.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	956/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 4	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 12	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 0701  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 863  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	4	8	4	3.43	1516/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	6	13	4.43	662/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	710/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	335/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	1227/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	723/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	3	8	3.75	1275/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	1	4.05	1503/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	10	2	3.81	1164/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	715/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	1216/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	686/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	1	12	3.95	1121/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	3.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	333/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	849/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	950/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	532/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 5	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 4	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 18	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 0801  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: MEADE, VICKI (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 864  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	7	7	4.06	1138/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	1065/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	557/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	7	4.00	1029/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	6	4	3.33	1326/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	759/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	583/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1190/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	12	1	3.93	1039/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	908/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	622/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	8	6	4.27	870/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	0	4	9	4.27	901/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	0	5	6	3.86	731/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	1055/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1013/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	742/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	607/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.90	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 1001  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 866  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	5	8	4.00	1173/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	4	10	4.12	1028/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	916/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	801/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	5	2	3	3.07	1418/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	1035/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	2	12	4.24	885/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	428/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	1	5	5	3.86	1132/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	939/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	760/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	556/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	1042/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	665/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	2	2	4	3.25	1265/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	1	0	10	4.31	846/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	1015/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	4	0	6	4.00	479/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	



Course Section: ENGL 393 1001  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 866  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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	14				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 393 1101  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HIRSCHHORN, DAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 867  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	5	2	5	2	1	2.47	1651/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	2.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	4	3	3	3.13	1563/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	4	4	3.47	1393/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	3.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	5	2	4	2	1	2.43	1530/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	4	3.67	1195/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	851/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	499/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	3	4	3	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	1	3	5	1	2.73	1481/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	2.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	1111/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	6	3	1	2.87	1440/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	2.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	2	2	2.73	1438/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	2.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	5	2	2	2	2.77	1193/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1389/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	2.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	950/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	1	0	4	3.86	1146/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	873/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	13

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

Course Section: ENGL 393 1201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: CHAPIN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 868  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1339/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	975/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	557/1421	4.40	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	821/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	5	3	4	3.47	1257/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	618/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	389/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	750/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	918/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	647/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	880/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	941/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.19	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	1042/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	483/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1338/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	3	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	
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 393 8020  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 869  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	816/1669	3.66	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	359/1666	4.08	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.19	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1326/1555	3.35	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	250/1543	4.14	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1474/1647	4.13	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1329/1668	4.57	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	584/1514	4.14	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1304/1551	4.57	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	386/1503	4.11	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	838/1506	3.90	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	189/1311	3.95	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	622/1490	3.48	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	818/1502	4.01	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	865/1489	4.14	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	967/1006	3.54	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
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: ENGL 393E 0201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 870  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	938/1669	4.57	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	483/1666	4.73	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	789/1421	4.57	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	760/1617	4.55	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	477/1555	4.53	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	371/1543	4.71	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	817/1647	4.59	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1431/1668	4.31	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	499/1605	4.60	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	799/1514	4.70	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	1284/1551	4.64	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	823/1503	4.61	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	642/1506	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	373/1311	4.57	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.86	4.20	4.05	4.11	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	438/1502	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	478/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.35	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	292/1006	4.71	3.89	4.00	4.10	4.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ENGL 393E 0201  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 870  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	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	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 393E 0301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 871  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 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	9	4.90	128/1669	4.57	4.04	4.23	4.28	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	103/1666	4.73	4.17	4.19	4.20	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	184/1421	4.57	4.29	4.24	4.25	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	161/1617	4.55	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	207/1555	4.53	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	104/1543	4.71	4.31	4.06	4.14	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.59	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	1240/1668	4.31	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/1605	4.60	4.10	4.07	4.09	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	189/1514	4.70	4.30	4.39	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.64	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	126/1503	4.61	4.25	4.24	4.28	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	164/1506	4.70	4.22	4.26	4.30	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	131/1311	4.57	3.26	3.85	3.97	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	4.86	4.20	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	4.86	4.49	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1006	4.71	3.89	4.00	4.10	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	4.20	4.20	4.17	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	4.40	4.19	4.13	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.38	4.50	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 223	****	4.44	4.35	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.27	4.15	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.60	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.19	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.29	4.39	3.82	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.17	3.97	3.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.19	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.08	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.19	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	4.08	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	4.15	4.34	4.13	****	

Course Section: ENGL 393E 0301  
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING  
 Instructor: BELFRAGE, MARY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 871  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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



Course Section: ENGL 394 0101  
 Title TECHNICAL EDITING  
 Instructor: HIRSCHHORN, DAN  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 872  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1657/1669	2.40	4.04	4.23	4.28	2.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	2.40	1641/1666	2.40	4.17	4.19	4.20	2.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1569/1617	2.80	4.25	4.15	4.22	2.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1539/1555	2.33	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1358/1543	3.20	4.31	4.06	4.14	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	2.00	1619/1647	2.00	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1561/1605	2.50	4.10	4.07	4.09	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	1510/1514	1.80	4.30	4.39	4.46	1.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1361/1551	4.20	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	2.20	1483/1503	2.20	4.25	4.24	4.28	2.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	2.20	1486/1506	2.20	4.22	4.26	4.30	2.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	2.40	1245/1311	2.40	3.26	3.85	3.97	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1431/1490	2.50	4.20	4.05	4.11	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1301/1502	3.50	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1361/1489	3.25	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 395 0101  
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 873  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	2	1	2.83	1604/1666	2.83	4.17	4.19	4.20	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	4	1	2.92	1548/1617	2.92	4.25	4.15	4.22	2.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	2	2	2	2.83	1478/1555	2.83	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	2	4	0	2.75	1488/1543	2.75	4.31	4.06	4.14	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	1	3	0	2.17	1615/1647	2.17	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.92	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1501/1605	3.78	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	4	1	3.25	1431/1514	3.27	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	1	6	4.00	1404/1551	4.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1452/1503	2.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	3	2	0	2.25	1482/1506	2.27	4.22	4.26	4.30	2.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	4	1	0	0	0	1.20	1293/1311	1.20	3.26	3.85	3.97	1.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1242/1490	3.30	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	1179/1502	3.80	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1237/1489	3.60	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	3	0	2	2	2.89	946/1006	2.89	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.89	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.29	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	40/ 52	3.29	4.19	4.06	3.59	3.29	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	30/ 39	3.80	4.29	4.39	3.82	3.80	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	2	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	31/ 40	3.20	4.17	3.97	3.34	3.20	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	

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	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 395 0101  
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP  
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 874  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1480/1669	3.50	4.04	4.23	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	2	1	2.83	1604/1666	2.83	4.17	4.19	4.20	2.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	4	1	2.92	1548/1617	2.92	4.25	4.15	4.22	2.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	2	2	2	2.83	1478/1555	2.83	3.96	4.00	4.03	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	2	4	0	2.75	1488/1543	2.75	4.31	4.06	4.14	2.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	1	3	0	2.17	1615/1647	2.17	4.02	4.12	4.14	2.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	641/1668	4.92	4.49	4.67	4.68	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1428/1605	3.78	4.10	4.07	4.09	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	1426/1514	3.27	4.30	4.39	4.46	3.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1404/1551	4.00	4.52	4.66	4.70	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	3	0	3	0	2.71	1455/1503	2.73	4.25	4.24	4.28	2.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	4	1	1	0	2.29	1480/1506	2.27	4.22	4.26	4.30	2.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	1.20	3.26	3.85	3.97	1.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1242/1490	3.30	4.20	4.05	4.11	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	1179/1502	3.80	4.28	4.26	4.28	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1237/1489	3.60	4.49	4.29	4.35	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	3	0	2	2	2.89	946/1006	2.89	3.89	4.00	4.10	2.89	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.60	4.22	4.29	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	1	1	3	1	3.29	40/ 52	3.29	4.19	4.06	3.59	3.29	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	30/ 39	3.80	4.29	4.39	3.82	3.80	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	2	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	31/ 40	3.20	4.17	3.97	3.34	3.20	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	5	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 30	****	4.42	4.33	3.49	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	7	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Major
			Other	4	Non-major
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		

Course Section: ENGL 401 0101  
 Title: METHOD OF INTERPRETATI  
 Instructor: EDINGER, WILLIA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 876  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	143/1669	4.75	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.66	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	255/1421	4.70	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1617	4.73	4.25	4.15	4.22	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1555	4.73	3.96	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	164/1543	4.50	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	759/1647	4.28	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	4.92	4.49	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1605	4.67	4.10	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.86	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	594/1551	4.82	4.52	4.66	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	438/1503	4.54	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.67	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1311	3.85	3.26	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	445/1490	4.43	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	393/1502	4.56	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	434/1489	4.47	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1006	4.29	3.89	4.00	4.21	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 1
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 401 0201  
 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI  
 Instructor: HOLTON, ADALAIN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 877  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	463/1669	4.75	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	516/1666	4.66	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	453/1421	4.70	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	568/1617	4.73	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	379/1555	4.73	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	680/1543	4.50	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	885/1647	4.28	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	825/1668	4.92	4.49	4.67	4.70	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	591/1605	4.67	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1514	4.86	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	862/1551	4.82	4.52	4.66	4.73	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	621/1503	4.54	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	10	4.46	693/1506	4.67	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	738/1311	3.85	3.26	3.85	3.88	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	594/1490	4.43	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	790/1502	4.56	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	960/1489	4.47	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	2	2	3	4	3.58	735/1006	4.29	3.89	4.00	4.21	3.58	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 405B 0101  
 Title THE RENAISSANCE  
 Instructor: ORLIN, LENA  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 878  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	207/1669	4.80	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	319/1666	4.70	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	100/1555	4.90	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	142/1543	4.80	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	651/1647	4.40	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	1039/1668	4.70	4.49	4.67	4.70	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	210/1605	4.70	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.70	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	277/1503	4.75	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	200/1506	4.88	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	904/1311	3.57	3.26	3.85	3.88	3.57	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	155/1490	4.89	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	370/1502	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.78	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	411/1489	4.78	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	344/1006	4.33	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course Section: ENGL 407 0101  
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY  
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 879  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	2	7	4.08	1124/1669	4.08	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1421	****	4.29	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	773/1555	4.00	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	9	4.38	534/1543	4.38	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1223/1647	3.83	4.02	4.12	4.14	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	10	1	3.85	1601/1668	3.85	4.49	4.67	4.70	3.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	871/1605	4.08	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1136/1514	4.17	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	677/1551	4.85	4.52	4.66	4.73	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1265/1503	3.69	4.25	4.24	4.27	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1153/1506	3.92	4.22	4.26	4.29	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	939/1311	3.50	3.26	3.85	3.88	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	400/1490	4.58	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	772/1502	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	532/1489	4.67	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	424/1006	4.17	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ENGL 410 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN GENRE STUDI  
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 880  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	151/1669	4.88	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1666	4.81	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	170/1421	4.88	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	70/1555	4.94	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	138/1543	4.81	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	185/1647	4.79	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.49	4.67	4.70	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	139/1605	4.80	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	132/1514	4.93	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.25	4.24	4.27	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	115/1506	4.93	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1311	****	3.26	3.85	3.88	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	113/1490	4.93	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.93	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	13	4.79	358/1502	4.79	4.28	4.26	4.46	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	224/1489	4.93	4.49	4.29	4.52	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1006	4.83	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		



Course Section: ENGL 486 0101  
 Title SEMINAR IN TEACHING CO  
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 881  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	175/1669	4.85	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	319/1666	4.69	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.29	4.24	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	465/1617	4.54	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	165/1555	4.77	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	226/1543	4.69	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	1007/1647	4.08	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	127/1605	4.83	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	360/1514	4.80	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	512/1551	4.90	4.52	4.66	4.73	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	126/1503	4.90	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	8	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	113/1490	4.92	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	328/1006	4.36	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.36	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 112	****	3.99	4.38	4.74	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.13	4.36	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.95	4.22	4.48	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 105	****	3.86	4.20	4.27	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 98	****	3.97	3.95	3.86	****	

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	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	0
84-150	7	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	10				
				?	0						

Course Section: ENGL 490 0101  
 Title ADV TOPICS IN ENGL LAN  
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 882  
 JAN 18, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	231/1669	4.79	4.04	4.23	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.17	4.19	4.22	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	789/1421	4.29	4.29	4.24	4.38	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	612/1617	4.43	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	285/1555	4.57	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	562/1543	4.36	4.31	4.06	4.18	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	728/1647	4.36	4.02	4.12	4.14	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.49	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	350/1605	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.16	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	291/1514	4.85	4.30	4.39	4.45	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.52	4.66	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	528/1503	4.54	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	340/1506	4.77	4.22	4.26	4.29	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	365/1311	4.36	3.26	3.85	3.88	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.20	4.05	4.26	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.49	4.29	4.52	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	292/1006	4.43	3.89	4.00	4.21	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	4	
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other		8
			? 0			