

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 692
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	754/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	425/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	367/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	597/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	281/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	298/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	398/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	18	2	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	312/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	602/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	546/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	239/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	401/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	1	1	1	0	5	3.88	753/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	329/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	489/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	134/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	2	3	2	7	3.63	674/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.63	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	4	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	1	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	7				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 693
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	1138/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	926/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	950/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	862/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	774/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	514/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	1289/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	841/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1237/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1414/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	973/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1198/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	2	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1213/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	426/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	816/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: TERHORST, RAYMO
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 694
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1089/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	170/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	517/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	363/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	598/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	306/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	281/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	1466/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	454/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	491/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	141/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	253/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	505/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 4		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	4
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 695
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	0	4	8	8	4.05	1110/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	567/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	16	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	****		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	741/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	1	3	9	7	4.10	700/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	313/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	756/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	3	15	3	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	646/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	602/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	546/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	371/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	511/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	7	12	4.50	265/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	525/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	710/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	558/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	0	8	3	4.00	456/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 19	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0801
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 696
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	3	7	5	3	3.00	1599/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	7	5	4	3.33	1536/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	3	6	1	0	2.50	1394/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	2.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	9	6	4	3.45	1427/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	6	6	2	2.86	1465/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	2.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	3	7	6	3.50	1212/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	5	4	4	6	3.33	1455/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	6	6	1	3.12	1460/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	3	5	3	6	3.30	1453/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	2	3	8	6	3.80	1457/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	1	11	4	1	2.95	1464/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	2.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	2	5	6	2	2.90	1464/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	2.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	14	3	1	1	0	1	2.17	1270/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	3	4	4	1	2.59	1350/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	6	2	2	3	4	2.82	1358/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	2.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	4	3	2	5	3	3.00	1320/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	4	2	1	2	1	2.40	928/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	2.40	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0801
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 696
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	4	A	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 697
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	2	10	6	3.86	1289/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	3	12	4.24	877/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	850/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	741/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	2	11	3.76	1035/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	14	4.19	667/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	5	10	4.10	982/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	3	6	7	5	0	2.67	1627/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	2.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	783/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	1077/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	979/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	1	3	11	4.22	917/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	2	3	11	4.17	972/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	623/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	2	12	4.11	735/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	290/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	286/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	267/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 0901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 697
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 1	A 9	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	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	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1001
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: DUNNIGAN, BRIAN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 698
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	1252/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	6	10	4.10	1021/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	2	2	4	4.25	795/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.25		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	548/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	419/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	404/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	4	10	4.05	1016/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	13	6	0	3.25	1610/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	3.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	569/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	947/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	273/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	474/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	677/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	16	0	1	4	0	0	2.80	****/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	386/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	507/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	563/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.83	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	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	6				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 699
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	1588/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1481/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1268/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	3.50	1406/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1402/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1212/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	2.75	1564/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1625/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	2.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1420/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1496/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	2.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1482/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1440/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1342/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1370/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1292/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	937/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	2.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 699
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	2	0	3.13	1588/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	3.50	1481/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1268/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	3.50	1406/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1402/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1212/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	2	0	2.75	1564/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	1	4	2	0	2.88	1625/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	2.88	
Lecture															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1347/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1440/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1342/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	1	2	0	2.67	1370/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1292/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	937/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	2.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

I	0	Other	3
?	0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 701
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1042/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	393/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1238/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	476/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	580/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	367/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	1	2	3.50	1399/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1350/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1079/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1077/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1247/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1106/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1321/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	944/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SCHMIDT, VIRGIN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 702
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	7	3	3.65	1428/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	667/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	878/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	726/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	4	2	6	3.44	1282/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	230/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1044/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1475/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	10	4	4.20	725/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	360/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	972/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	1035/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	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	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
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 100 1401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 703
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3	1	3	7	3	3.35	1541/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	1193/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	7	3	3.79	1160/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	919/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	3	4	1	4	2.76	1475/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	2.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	824/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	7	7	4.12	965/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	463/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	6	5	3	3.60	1270/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	1220/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	1264/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.41	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	3	4	8	3.94	1142/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	3	7	3.82	1204/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	13	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	****/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	3	6	3.77	958/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	1141/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	0	5	6	4.08	925/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 7	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MACEK, PHILIP
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 705
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	7	5	6	3.50	1497/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	12	7	4.14	981/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	687/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	476/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	3	9	5	3	3.40	1300/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	2	12	4.09	775/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	7	5	8	3.95	1109/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	8	4.36	1265/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	818/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	1061/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	1239/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	843/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	1127/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	838/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	1	3	3	8	3.82	920/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	557/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.59	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	423/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	13	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	11	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	22	Non-major	22
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			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	4	
?	0			

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 706
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	880/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.26	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	382/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	477/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	476/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	640/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	268/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	16	4.74	238/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	0	8	6	3.94	989/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	0	16	4.68	575/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	699/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	700/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	14	4.53	614/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	474/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	546/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	736/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	674/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	3	1	3	2	4	3.23	810/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.23	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 12	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 16
84-150	0	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 5	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 1901
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 707
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	4	9	4	3.62	1447/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	8	4.00	1090/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	7	4.05	981/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	707/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	629/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	4	10	3.90	1175/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	943/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	6	4.24	680/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.24	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	360/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	546/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	726/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	9	10	4.40	769/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	2	0	3	1	3	3.33	1067/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	309/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	462/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	171/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	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 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2001
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 708
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	615/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	517/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	447/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	476/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	633/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	416/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	718/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	1067/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	257/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	382/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	230/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	457/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	2	1	1	1	3	3.25	1101/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	403/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	227/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	423/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	364/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.22	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FETTNER, PETER
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 709
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	9	0	5	1	1	2.06	1636/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	2.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	7	2	7	0	0	2.00	1637/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	1394/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	2.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	6	6	3	1	0	1.94	1579/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	1.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	5	1	3	3	2.87	1465/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	2.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	5	3	2	0	2.13	1492/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	2.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	4	2	4	2	1	2.54	1574/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	2.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	4	9	1	0	2.67	1627/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	2.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	8	2	2	1	0	1.69	1579/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	1.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	5	3	3	4	0	2.40	1505/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	2.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	1495/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	3.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	4	1	3	2	2.53	1499/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	2.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	4	1	3	1	2.27	1509/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	2.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	3	1	1	1	0	2.00	1273/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	3	5	0	2.92	1308/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	5	2	4	1	3.08	1310/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.08
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1095/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	917/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	2.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
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				
				?	4						

Course-Section: ENGL 100 2501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PUTZEL, DIANE M
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 711
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	4	2	9	6	3.81	1326/1639	3.78	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	774/1639	4.14	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	19	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	15	4.57	402/1583	4.15	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	8	6	6	3.81	989/1532	3.84	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	506/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	4	10	3.95	1109/1612	3.91	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	16	0	3.76	1588/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	3.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	569/1579	4.00	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	561/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1520	4.67	4.71	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	674/1517	4.24	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	638/1550	4.07	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	413/1295	3.50	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	2	8	7	4.05	752/1398	4.01	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	2	2	3	11	4.11	936/1391	4.10	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	471/1388	4.37	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	508/ 958	3.50	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.93	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 12	Required for Majors	21
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 22
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	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BROFMAN, MARGAR
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 712
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	5	9	5	3.57	1471/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	9	4	3.57	1458/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	2	6	3	5	3.53	1264/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	5	5	8	3.86	1192/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	8	7	6	3.65	1144/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	5	6	9	3.78	1026/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	5	6	3	6	3.17	1494/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	1067/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	3	9	7	2	3.27	1412/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	6	7	6	3.76	1364/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	6	4	9	3.95	1429/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	3.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	4	7	5	3.60	1310/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	4	7	5	3.48	1340/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	3	5	0	3	0	2.27	1264/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	4	3	4	3	3.00	1271/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	5	2	3	4	3	2.88	1349/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	2	3	4	6	3.59	1162/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	6	3	1	4	1	2	2.82	887/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	2.82	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 1	A 3	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 23 Non-major 23
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 2		
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 8	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 713
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	6	9	4.00	1138/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	517/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	261/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	7	12	4.38	625/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	478/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	336/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	790/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	1235/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	725/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	435/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	872/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	405/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	511/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	2	2	4	8	3.78	825/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	2	4	6	3.73	980/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	1	3	7	3.80	1124/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1201/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	3	2	5	2	3.14	827/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 713
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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 100A 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 714
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	6	9	4.00	1138/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	517/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	261/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.77		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	7	12	4.38	625/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	478/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	336/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	6	4	12	4.27	790/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	10	4.41	1235/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	312/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1087/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	556/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	****/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	2	4	6	3.73	980/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	3	1	3	7	3.80	1124/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1201/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	2	3	2	5	2	3.14	827/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KIDD, KATHLEEN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 714
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
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 100A 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: BLOOM, RYAN I.
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 715
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1326/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1326/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1324/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	774/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	638/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1190/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1257/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	806/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	602/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1007/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1171/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1265/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	386/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	334/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 716
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	7	7	3.67	1416/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	1014/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	705/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	7	11	4.35	669/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	7	4	3	3.10	1410/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	5	11	4.05	802/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	14	4.52	469/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1155/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	1206/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	872/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	5	12	4.29	854/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	944/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	768/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	7	2	3.64	1045/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	903/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	925/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	682/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: KILLGALLON, DON
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 716
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
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	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0501
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 717
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	4	12	4.18	964/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	5	10	4.00	1090/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	722/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	8	9	4.05	981/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	5	8	3.76	1035/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	667/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	5	4	11	4.14	934/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	16	3	4.05	1479/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	8	6	3.90	1056/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	451/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	796/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	3	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	329/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	489/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 8	General 0	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FETTNER, PETER
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 718
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	5	3	3.27	1563/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	3	0	5	1	2.47	1630/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1396/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	2.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	3	1	4	2	3	3.08	1523/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	3.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	3	4	3.57	1201/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	6	4	2	3.20	1358/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	6	4	1	1	0	1.75	1601/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	1.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	10	3	2	0	0	1.47	1634/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	1.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	3	0	4	2	0	2.56	1551/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	2	5	5	0	2.80	1497/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	2.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	3	10	4.33	1318/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1433/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	5	3	2	3.00	1440/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	3	1	1	0	0	1.60	1289/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	1.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	2	5	1	3.08	1262/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1106/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	887/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0601
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FETTNER, PETER
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 718
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
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	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 719
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	8	6	3.86	1289/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	10	6	3.95	1176/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1332/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	0	7	10	4.26	781/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	7	7	3.76	1035/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	9	8	4.10	775/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	2	13	4.00	1044/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1087/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	6	5	3	3.79	1148/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	968/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	1101/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	5	5	10	4.10	1030/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	5	8	3.81	1215/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	4	7	7	3.85	768/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	5	6	3.67	1030/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	6	3	3	5	3.28	1278/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.28	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	821/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	712/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.53	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0701
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 719
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	0	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FETTNER, PETER (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 720
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1138/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	970/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	973/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	0	4	6	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	293/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	0	3	6	3.83	990/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	1548/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	2.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	3.57	1600/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	3.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	3	1	2	4	2	3.08	1465/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	2.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1341/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	890/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	886/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	972/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1237/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	5	2	2	3.18	1229/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1118/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	533/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	456/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	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	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
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	3						
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100A 0801
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: FETTNER, PETER (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 721
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	1138/1639	3.83	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	970/1639	3.92	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	973/1397	3.93	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	0	4	6	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	293/1532	3.97	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	0	3	6	3.83	990/1504	4.03	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	2	2	3	3	1	2.91	1548/1612	3.58	3.88	4.16	4.10	2.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	8	0	3.57	1600/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.56	3.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1574/1579	3.53	4.05	4.08	3.95	2.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1419/1518	4.15	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	4.66	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1077/1550	4.01	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1295	2.89	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	5	2	2	3.18	1229/1398	3.65	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	1118/1391	3.89	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	533/1388	4.22	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	456/ 958	3.57	3.83	3.93	3.71	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 4	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 14
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 3	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 100H 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 722
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	992/1639	4.13	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.22	4.19	4.01	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1504	4.88	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	1	2	3.38	1447/1612	3.38	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1350/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1579	4.88	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.88

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	1318/1520	4.33	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	800/1517	4.33	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 5	Required for Majors	3 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 8 Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 100P 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 723
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1003/1639	4.15	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	583/1639	4.46	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	444/1583	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	216/1532	4.69	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	134/1504	4.85	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	3	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1311/1635	4.31	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	8	1	3.80	1133/1579	3.80	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	561/1518	4.69	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1517	4.46	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	690/1550	4.46	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1237/1295	2.60	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	296/1388	4.83	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	234/ 958	4.45	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 724
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	3	2	0	2.27	1633/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	2.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	2	0	2.55	1626/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	0	1	2.82	1566/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	2.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	0	6	0	0	2.09	1519/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	2.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	1	2	3.30	1323/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	0	4	0	0	1.80	1599/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	1.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	4	4	1	2	0	2.09	1571/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	6	3	2	0	0	1.64	1516/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	1414/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	3	0	1	0	1.60	1513/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	2	0	0	1.70	1543/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	2	1	0	1	2.00	1273/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1367/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1146/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1047/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	682/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	77/ 85	3.83	4.27	4.58	4.50	3.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	81/ 82	2.83	3.65	4.52	4.12	2.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	74/ 78	3.20	3.70	4.47	4.25	3.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	71/ 80	3.50	3.97	4.47	4.39	3.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	60/ 82	3.67	3.64	4.16	3.90	3.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 724
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 725
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	2	3	2	0	2.27	1633/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	2.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	2	0	2.55	1626/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	0	1	2.82	1566/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	2.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	0	6	0	0	2.09	1519/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	2.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	1	2	3.30	1323/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	0	4	0	0	1.80	1599/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	1.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	6	1	3.75	1170/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	1118/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1292/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	597/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1077/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1089/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1367/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1146/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1047/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	682/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	77/ 85	3.83	4.27	4.58	4.50	3.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	81/ 82	2.83	3.65	4.52	4.12	2.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	74/ 78	3.20	3.70	4.47	4.25	3.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	71/ 80	3.50	3.97	4.47	4.39	3.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	60/ 82	3.67	3.64	4.16	3.90	3.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0101
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 725
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
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				
				?	1						

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	4	2	3	2	0	2.27	1633/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	2.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	2	0	2.55	1626/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	2.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	0	1	2.82	1566/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	2.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	0	6	0	0	2.09	1519/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	2.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	5	1	2	3.30	1323/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	6	0	4	0	0	1.80	1599/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	1.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	691/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	242/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1033/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	716/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	864/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	1	0	2.38	1367/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	2.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	1146/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1047/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	682/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	3.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	77/ 85	3.83	4.27	4.58	4.50	3.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	81/ 82	2.83	3.65	4.52	4.12	2.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	74/ 78	3.20	3.70	4.47	4.25	3.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	71/ 80	3.50	3.97	4.47	4.39	3.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	60/ 82	3.67	3.64	4.16	3.90	3.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0201
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 727
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	3	4	5	3.60	1454/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	7	4	3.87	1287/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1010/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1241/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	585/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	4	5	2	3.36	1451/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	529/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1257/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	3	3	4	3.62	1402/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1166/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1283/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1344/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	10	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1002/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	940/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	877/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	456/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	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	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
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 100Y 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 728
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1435/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1427/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	536/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	7	1	3.70	1104/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	594/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	982/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1133/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	1203/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	1025/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	860/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	481/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1106/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1106/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1065/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	307/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0301
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: WALTERS, APRIL (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 729
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	1435/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	3.64	1427/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	536/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	0	7	1	3.70	1104/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	594/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	982/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	662/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1232/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.73	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1106/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1106/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1065/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	307/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 100Y 0401
 Title COMPOSITION
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 730
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	990/1639	3.12	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1306/1639	3.23	4.09	4.22	4.17	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	973/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	392/1583	3.71	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	655/1532	3.05	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	701/1504	3.84	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	814/1612	3.03	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	3.75	1589/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.56	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	1208/1579	3.55	4.05	4.08	3.95	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1318/1518	3.73	4.30	4.43	4.38	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1520	4.53	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	0	6	4.00	1083/1517	3.80	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1029/1550	3.67	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1213/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.84	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	355/1398	3.21	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	719/1391	3.91	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	546/1388	4.01	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	179/ 958	4.01	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 12 Non-major 12
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 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0101
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 731
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	780/1639	4.16	4.05	4.27	4.08	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	12	4.41	667/1639	4.35	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	661/1397	4.16	4.25	4.28	4.18	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	929/1583	4.28	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	677/1532	3.95	4.02	4.01	3.88	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	0	2	11	4.19	678/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	546/1612	4.35	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	4	4.13	1441/1635	4.36	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.44	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	1021/1518	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	837/1520	4.74	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	560/1517	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	787/1550	4.44	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	545/1295	3.80	3.42	3.94	3.84	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	742/1398	4.04	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	1106/1391	4.02	4.39	4.30	4.07	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	0	2	1	7	3.92	1025/1388	4.26	4.47	4.28	4.01	3.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	234/ 958	4.48	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0201
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 732
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	5	0	10	3.94	1206/1639	4.16	4.05	4.27	4.08	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	822/1639	4.35	4.09	4.22	4.17	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	1	3	2	7	3.93	1063/1397	4.16	4.25	4.28	4.18	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	560/1583	4.28	4.22	4.19	4.01	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	2	7	3.76	1035/1532	3.95	4.02	4.01	3.88	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	797/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	3.78	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	3	10	4.24	837/1612	4.35	3.88	4.16	4.10	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	2	0	14	4.59	1080/1635	4.36	4.32	4.65	4.56	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	702/1579	4.44	4.05	4.08	3.95	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	807/1518	4.42	4.30	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	1006/1520	4.74	4.71	4.70	4.61	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	875/1517	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.20	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	638/1550	4.44	4.17	4.22	4.17	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1000/1295	3.80	3.42	3.94	3.84	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	770/1398	4.04	4.20	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	863/1391	4.02	4.39	4.30	4.07	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	571/1388	4.26	4.47	4.28	4.01	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	201/ 958	4.48	3.83	3.93	3.71	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 110 0201
 Title COMPOSITION ESL STUDEN
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 732
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ENGL 210 0201
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LIT
 Instructor: FINDLAY, JOANNE
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 733
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	3	11	14	4.28	870/1639	4.28	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	7	8	11	3.90	1268/1639	3.90	4.09	4.22	4.27	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	1	6	19	4.41	646/1397	4.41	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	6	11	11	4.18	871/1583	4.18	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	23	4.68	229/1532	4.68	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	8	7	13	4.18	690/1504	4.18	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	5	8	12	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	8	19	1	3.75	1589/1635	3.75	4.32	4.65	4.63	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	7	11	5	3.91	1039/1579	3.91	4.05	4.08	4.14	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	4	7	13	4.24	1110/1518	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	24	4.88	597/1520	4.88	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	10	14	4.42	700/1517	4.42	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	7	17	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	10	2	3	4	3	3	3.13	1140/1295	3.13	3.42	3.94	4.07	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	294/1398	4.71	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	351/1388	4.79	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	10	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	****	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.28	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 226 0101
 Title ENGLISH GRAMMAR USAGE
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 734
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	3	9	6	3.86	1289/1639	3.86	4.05	4.27	4.35	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	1021/1639	4.10	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	850/1397	4.19	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	900/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	7	8	4.11	700/1532	4.11	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	8	6	3.76	1042/1504	3.76	4.30	4.05	4.09	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	882/1612	4.19	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	13	4	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	5	7	2	3.67	1232/1579	3.67	4.05	4.08	4.14	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	905/1518	4.44	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	925/1520	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	726/1517	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1000/1550	4.13	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1143/1295	3.13	3.42	3.94	4.07	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	728/1398	4.11	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	609/1388	4.56	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	3.83	3.93	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.28	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	3.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 21
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 233 0101
 Title ISSUES IN WORLD LIT
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 735
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	4	11	9	3.96	1183/1639	3.96	4.05	4.27	4.35	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	12	7	3.85	1300/1639	3.85	4.09	4.22	4.27	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	9	12	4.27	785/1397	4.27	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.27		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	1	2	6	6	7	3.73	1282/1583	3.73	4.22	4.19	4.28	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	203/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	4	7	8	4.21	647/1504	4.21	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	5	6	6	8	3.68	1316/1612	3.68	3.88	4.16	4.21	3.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	1045/1635	4.63	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	13	4	3.95	972/1579	3.95	4.05	4.08	4.14	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	1000/1518	4.35	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	872/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	1	8	11	4.38	747/1517	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	7	11	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	9	4	0	3	0	3	2.80	1213/1295	2.80	3.42	3.94	4.07	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	342/1398	4.64	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	678/1391	4.43	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	721/1388	4.43	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	7	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	****	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	16
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	1
			Required for Majors	5	Graduate
			General	8	Under-grad
			Electives	1	26
			Other	8	Non-major
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		

Course-Section: ENGL 241A 0101
 Title MODERN BRITISH NOVEL
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 736
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	5	4	3	3.57	1466/1639	3.57	4.05	4.27	4.35	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	2	7	4.07	1036/1639	4.07	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	8	4.14	897/1397	4.14	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	832/1583	4.21	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	419/1532	4.43	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	629/1504	4.23	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.23	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	996/1612	4.07	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1056/1579	3.90	4.05	4.08	4.14	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	670/1518	4.62	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	747/1517	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	860/1550	4.31	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	745/1398	4.08	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	2	3	1	5	3.38	1252/1391	3.38	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	802/1388	4.31	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	4	1	4	0	1	2.30	933/ 958	2.30	3.83	3.93	4.00	2.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 241B 0101
 Title BEAUTY PLEASURE DEC IM
 Instructor: PEKARSKE, NICOL
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 737
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	550/1639	4.56	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	1044/1639	4.06	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	661/1397	4.40	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	603/1504	4.27	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	3	11	1	3.75	1589/1635	3.75	4.32	4.65	4.63	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	2	0	5	4	3.75	1170/1579	3.75	4.05	4.08	4.14	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1162/1518	4.17	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	4	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	816/1391	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 243A 0101
 Title WRITERS LOOK AT WAR
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 738
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	6	12	12	4.10	1075/1639	4.10	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	19	9	4.16	948/1639	4.16	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	12	14	4.33	722/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	14	12	4.20	852/1583	4.20	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	197/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	13	15	4.43	453/1504	4.43	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	12	12	4.17	913/1612	4.17	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	26	3	4.10	1454/1635	4.10	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	16	5	4.04	865/1579	4.04	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	957/1518	4.39	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	382/1520	4.93	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	13	12	4.28	864/1517	4.28	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	8	16	4.43	742/1550	4.43	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	1	7	7	7	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.42	3.94	4.07	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	5	12	4.29	599/1398	4.29	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	579/1391	4.55	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	3	10	4	3.89	540/ 958	3.89	3.83	3.93	4.00	3.89	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	3	Under-grad	31	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101
 Title COMIC BOOK LITERATURE
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 739
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	6	8	18	4.21	939/1639	4.21	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	15	14	4.18	937/1639	4.18	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	2	2	4	16	4.42	646/1397	4.42	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	3	4	8	16	4.09	946/1583	4.09	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	158/1532	4.79	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	8	5	18	4.25	612/1504	4.25	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	7	3	19	4.06	1010/1612	4.06	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	13	19	1	3.59	1599/1635	3.59	4.32	4.65	4.63	3.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	506/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	1	28	4.84	725/1520	4.84	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	6	4	20	4.47	648/1517	4.47	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	1	23	4.48	664/1550	4.48	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	24	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	616/1398	4.26	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	639/1391	4.47	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	411/1388	4.74	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	14	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	32	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 243B 0101
 Title COMIC BOOK LITERATURE
 Instructor: BLUMBERG, ARNOL
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 739
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	16	Under-grad	34	Non-major	34
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 250 0101
 Title INTRO TO SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 740
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	281/1639	4.78	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	696/1639	4.39	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	9	4.09	942/1397	4.09	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	371/1583	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	137/1532	4.83	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	14	4.43	453/1504	4.43	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	644/1612	4.39	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1342/1635	4.26	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	590/1579	4.32	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.30	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	174/1550	4.90	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	383/1295	4.35	3.42	3.94	4.07	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	303/1398	4.71	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	380/1391	4.76	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	244/1388	4.88	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	2	4	4	2	3.31	794/ 958	3.31	3.83	3.93	4.00	3.31	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENGL 271 0101
 Title INTRO CREAT WRTG-FICTI
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 741
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	508/1639	4.61	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	220/1639	4.78	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	408/1397	4.62	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	111/1504	4.91	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	561/1612	4.45	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	122/1579	4.86	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.86	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	286/1518	4.85	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	328/1520	4.95	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	838/1295	3.75	3.42	3.94	4.07	3.75	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	300/1391	4.83	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	629/ 958	3.73	3.83	3.93	4.00	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 273 0101
 Title INT CREATIVE WTG-POETR
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 742
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	281/1639	4.79	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	295/1639	4.71	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	487/1397	4.54	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	299/1583	4.69	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	488/1532	4.36	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	163/1504	4.79	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	934/1612	4.14	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1023/1635	4.64	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	770/1518	4.54	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	287/1517	4.77	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	338/1550	4.77	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	346/1295	4.40	3.42	3.94	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1398	4.90	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	3.83	3.93	4.00	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0101
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 743
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	318/1639	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	517/1639	4.44	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	795/1397	4.38	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	323/1583	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	714/1532	3.78	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	306/1504	4.66	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	8	2	4.00	1044/1612	4.29	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	2	4.08	1462/1635	4.41	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	601/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1021/1518	4.46	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1520	4.86	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	1016/1517	4.42	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	716/1550	4.35	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1295	3.40	3.42	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	721/1398	4.62	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	258/1391	4.92	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	610/ 958	4.22	3.83	3.93	4.00	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 9
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 291 0201
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: FALLON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 744
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	1096/1639	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	992/1639	4.44	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1397	4.38	4.25	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	371/1583	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	5	3	3	3.27	1357/1532	3.78	4.02	4.01	4.09	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	230/1504	4.66	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	802/1612	4.29	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	11	4	4.27	1342/1635	4.41	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	569/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	933/1518	4.46	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	437/1520	4.86	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	498/1517	4.42	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	972/1550	4.35	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1295	3.40	3.42	3.94	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1398	4.62	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1391	4.92	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	296/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	260/ 958	4.22	3.83	3.93	4.00	4.42	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 16 Non-major 7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 291 0301
 Title INTRO WRTG CREAT ESSAY
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 745
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	698/1639	4.42	4.05	4.27	4.35	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	306/1639	4.44	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1397	4.38	4.25	4.28	4.39	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	413/1583	4.61	4.22	4.19	4.28	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	774/1532	3.78	4.02	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	215/1504	4.66	4.30	4.05	4.09	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	376/1612	4.29	3.88	4.16	4.21	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1635	4.41	4.32	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	342/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.14	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	656/1518	4.46	4.30	4.43	4.48	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	622/1520	4.86	4.71	4.70	4.78	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	523/1517	4.42	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	729/1550	4.35	4.17	4.22	4.33	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1035/1295	3.40	3.42	3.94	4.07	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1398	4.62	4.20	4.07	4.14	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.92	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	459/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.37	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	201/ 958	4.22	3.83	3.93	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 18 Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 301 0101
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: FARABAUGH, ROBI
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 746
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	582/1639	4.60	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	415/1639	4.61	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	517/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	186/1583	4.75	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	236/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	195/1504	4.67	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	546/1612	4.56	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.86	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	601/1579	4.38	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	286/1518	4.73	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	198/1517	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	313/1550	4.76	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	505/1295	4.20	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	217/1398	4.79	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	159/1391	4.82	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	265/1388	4.72	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	325/ 958	4.40	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.31	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 6
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 301 0201
 Title ANALYSIS LITERARY LANG
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 747
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	430/1639	4.60	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	404/1639	4.61	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	408/1397	4.56	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	292/1583	4.75	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	165/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	283/1504	4.67	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	340/1612	4.56	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	928/1635	4.86	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	427/1579	4.38	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	684/1518	4.73	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	323/1517	4.80	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	376/1550	4.76	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	4.20	3.42	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	234/1398	4.79	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	441/1391	4.82	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	593/1388	4.72	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	201/ 958	4.40	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 18	Non-major 6
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 13		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ENGL 303 0101
 Title ART OF THE ESSAY
 Instructor: OLIVER, LAURA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 748
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	7	10	4.44	698/1639	4.44	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	231/1639	4.78	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	217/1583	4.78	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	2	11	4.33	506/1532	4.33	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	67/1504	4.94	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	718/1612	4.33	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	332/1579	4.56	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	397/1518	4.79	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	875/1550	4.29	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	172/1398	4.89	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1388	4.89	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	682/ 958	3.60	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.60	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
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
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 304 0101
 Title BRIT LIT:MEDIEVAL/RENA
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 749
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	926/1639	4.19	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	444/1583	4.53	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	121/1532	4.87	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	291/1504	4.60	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	669/1612	4.38	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	2	4.13	1441/1635	4.13	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	439/1579	4.45	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	863/1518	4.46	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1388	4.70	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 1		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	10
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENGL 306 0101
 Title BRIT LIT: VICTORIAN-MO
 Instructor: DONOVAN, JULIE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 750
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	391/1639	4.70	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	230/1397	4.80	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	186/1583	4.80	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.02	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	222/1504	4.70	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	113/1612	4.90	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.90	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	535/1517	4.56	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	196/1550	4.89	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.90	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	111/ 958	4.78	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	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	9
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 307 0101
 Title AM LIT TO CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 751
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	2	11	7	3.96	1195/1639	3.96	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	800/1639	4.32	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	11	4.30	749/1397	4.30	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	9	4.26	781/1583	4.26	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	9	12	4.35	497/1532	4.35	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	521/1504	4.36	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	860/1612	4.22	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	968/1635	4.70	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1102/1579	3.84	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	0	7	12	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	1136/1520	4.57	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	4	6	8	3.90	1182/1517	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	3	3	11	3.86	1188/1550	3.86	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	12	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	953/1295	3.56	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	5	9	3.90	887/1398	3.90	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	2	15	4.52	601/1391	4.52	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	558/1388	4.62	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	674/ 958	3.63	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.63	

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 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 1	Under-grad 23 Non-major 5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 4	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 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 308 0101
 Title AM LIT AFTER CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 752
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	1044/1639	4.06	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.75	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	524/1583	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	299/1532	4.56	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	428/1612	4.56	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1114/1635	4.53	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	702/1579	4.21	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	382/1520	4.94	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	451/1517	4.63	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	796/1550	4.38	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	2	6	4	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	582/1398	4.31	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	380/1391	4.77	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	286/1388	4.85	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	603/ 958	3.77	3.83	3.93	3.97	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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0101
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 753
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	1	4	7	3	3.47	1506/1639	3.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	8	4	2	3.24	1557/1639	3.20	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1397	3.75	4.25	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	8	5	4.06	967/1583	3.67	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	9	4	3.76	1035/1532	3.47	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	10	2	3.81	1003/1504	3.63	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	7	3	2	3.13	1506/1612	2.96	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	1366/1635	4.44	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	6	0	3.38	1371/1579	3.39	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1428/1518	3.23	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	1087/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	6	2	3.47	1361/1517	3.15	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	3	3	5	3.47	1344/1550	2.98	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	459/1295	4.25	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	715/1398	3.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	489/1391	4.13	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	740/1388	3.80	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	690/ 958	3.58	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.58	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
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			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	14	
?	1			

Course-Section: ENGL 324 0201
 Title THEORIES OF COMM TECH
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 754
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	2	4	4	3.54	1484/1639	3.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1568/1639	3.20	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1175/1397	3.75	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1479/1583	3.67	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1384/1532	3.47	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	7	0	2	3.44	1240/1504	3.63	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	1	3	1	2	2.80	1558/1612	2.96	3.88	4.16	4.12	2.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1034/1635	4.44	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	0	6	1	3.40	1364/1579	3.39	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1481/1518	3.23	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1479/1517	3.15	4.24	4.27	4.23	2.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	0	1	1	1	2.50	1491/1550	2.98	4.17	4.22	4.20	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	4.25	3.42	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1222/1398	3.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1192/1391	4.13	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1282/1388	3.80	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 958	3.58	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 755
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	371/1639	4.64	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	250/1397	4.79	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	5	3	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	984/1504	3.85	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	694/1612	4.36	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	840/1635	4.79	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	747/1517	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	424/1550	4.69	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	582/1398	4.31	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	594/1391	4.54	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	558/1388	4.62	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	806/ 958	3.25	3.83	3.93	3.97	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	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	2
84-150	3	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	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 332 0101
 Title CONTEMP AMERICAN LIT
 Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 756
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	11	4	4.19	926/1639	4.19	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	767/1397	4.29	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	117/1532	4.88	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	560/1504	4.31	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	996/1612	4.08	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.08	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	1094/1635	4.56	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	473/1579	4.43	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	435/1518	4.77	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	287/1517	4.77	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	139/1550	4.92	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	590/1295	4.08	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1398	4.78	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1388	4.89	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	895/ 958	2.75	3.83	3.93	3.97	2.75	

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	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 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	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 351 0101
 Title STUDIES IN SHAKESPEARE
 Instructor: OSHEROW, MICHEL
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 757
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	582/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	486/1639	4.54	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	444/1583	4.54	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	94/1532	4.92	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	617/1612	4.42	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	1114/1635	4.54	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	527/1579	4.38	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	170/1518	4.92	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	206/1517	4.85	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	242/1550	4.85	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	436/1295	4.29	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	296/1388	4.83	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	364/ 958	4.22	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.22	

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 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	13
84-150	4	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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 364 0101
 Title: PERSP ON WOMEN IN LIT
 Instructor: SMITH, ORIANNE
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 758
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	342/1639	4.74	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	273/1639	4.74	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	189/1397	4.86	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	207/1583	4.78	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	94/1532	4.91	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	163/1504	4.78	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	155/1612	4.83	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	12	4.52	1121/1635	4.52	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.52	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	332/1579	4.55	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	79/1517	4.95	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	87/1550	4.95	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	18	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	172/1398	4.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	136/1391	4.94	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	386/ 958	4.19	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.19	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 14	Under-grad 23 Non-major 9
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 2		

Course-Section: ENGL 371 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-FICTI
 Instructor: GOODMAN, IVY
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 759
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	1029/1639	4.08	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	181/1583	4.82	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	138/1504	4.83	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1253/1612	3.80	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	3.75	1170/1579	3.75	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	1347/1518	3.82	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	776/1520	4.82	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	7	3	4.09	1030/1517	4.09	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	1250/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	211/1398	4.82	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	321/1391	4.82	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	423/1388	4.73	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	610/ 958	3.75	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	4	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	6
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 373 0101
 Title CREATIVE WRITING-POETR
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 760
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	1136/1532	3.67	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	245/1504	4.67	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1122/1295	3.20	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	511/1398	4.40	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 6
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 375 0101
 Title MASTERWORKS FOR WRITER
 Instructor: SHIVNAN, SALLY
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 761
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	572/1639	4.55	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	476/1639	4.55	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	654/1583	4.36	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	478/1532	4.36	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	429/1504	4.45	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	796/1635	4.82	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1518	4.64	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	943/1520	4.73	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	547/1517	4.55	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	703/1550	4.45	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1247/1295	2.50	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	682/1398	4.18	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	516/1391	4.64	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	533/1388	4.64	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	544/ 958	3.88	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.88	

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	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	3	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	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 379 0101
 Title PRINS/PRACT IN TECH CO
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 762
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1326/1639	3.80	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1444/1639	3.60	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	3	4	3.60	1184/1532	3.60	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	770/1504	4.10	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	1235/1635	4.40	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	481/1295	4.22	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	10	Non-major	1
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			

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

Course-Section: ENGL 380 0101
 Title INTRO TO NEWS WRITING
 Instructor: WEISS, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 763
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1326/1639	3.80	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	1	4	3.50	1406/1583	3.50	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	0	3	3.10	1409/1532	3.10	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1482/1612	3.22	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1463/1579	3.10	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	1	5	3.90	1318/1518	3.90	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	1273/1520	4.40	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	1182/1517	3.90	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	1259/1550	3.70	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	0	1	4	3.44	1012/1295	3.44	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	1198/1398	3.29	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	1	0	3	3.14	1300/1391	3.14	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1056/1388	3.86	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	

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 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	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	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 382 0101
 Title FEATURE WRITING
 Instructor: CORBETT, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 764
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	524/1583	4.47	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	3	7	3.94	869/1532	3.94	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	126/1504	4.87	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	955/1612	4.13	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	979/1635	4.69	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	491/1520	4.92	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	214/1517	4.83	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	10	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1295	****	3.42	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	380/1398	4.58	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	204/1391	4.92	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 387 0101
 Title Web Content Develop
 Instructor: Burgess, Helen
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 23
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	832/1639	****	4.31	4.27	4.08	4.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	393/1639	****	4.37	4.22	4.17	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	****	4.51	4.28	4.18	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	323/1583	****	4.31	4.19	4.01	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	6	4	3.67	1136/1532	****	4.07	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	977/1504	****	4.14	4.05	3.78	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	186/1612	****	4.13	4.16	4.10	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	1288/1635	****	4.78	4.65	4.56	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	527/1579	****	4.13	4.08	3.95	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1126/1518	****	4.46	4.43	4.38	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	837/1520	****	4.76	4.70	4.61	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	700/1517	****	4.43	4.27	4.20	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	927/1550	****	4.20	4.22	4.17	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	481/1295	****	4.31	3.94	3.84	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	770/1398	****	4.37	4.07	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	662/1391	****	4.60	4.30	4.07	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	609/1388	****	4.53	4.28	4.01	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	119/ 958	****	4.39	3.93	3.71	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	10	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	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0201
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 765
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	4	7	0	3.00	1599/1639	3.76	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	6	2	3.13	1572/1639	3.74	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	1	4	5	3.44	1290/1397	4.10	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	5	2	4	3.19	1501/1583	3.94	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	4	1	3	2.56	1495/1532	3.62	4.02	4.01	4.05	2.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	1	5	3	3.00	1415/1504	3.94	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	5	1	6	3.44	1428/1612	3.81	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1175/1635	4.52	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	6	4	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.65	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	5	2	7	3.93	1293/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1115/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	4	3	3.43	1376/1517	4.09	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	4	3	2	2.93	1459/1550	3.77	4.17	4.22	4.20	2.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	1247/1295	2.38	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	5	1	4	0	2	2.42	1363/1398	3.80	4.20	4.07	4.13	2.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1265/1391	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	5	1	5	3.75	1095/1388	4.49	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 958	3.55	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	

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 4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 16 Non-major 12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0301
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: SNEERINGER, HOL
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 766
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	880/1639	3.76	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	650/1639	3.74	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	196/1397	4.10	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	597/1583	3.94	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	236/1532	3.62	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	291/1504	3.94	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	459/1612	3.81	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	1288/1635	4.52	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	702/1579	3.65	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	919/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	837/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	597/1517	4.09	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	638/1550	3.77	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	2	1	0	0	1	2.25	1265/1295	2.38	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	200/1398	3.80	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1391	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1388	4.49	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	349/ 958	3.55	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 15
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	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 391 0401
 Title ADV EXPOS & ARGUMENT
 Instructor: BURNS, MARGIE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 767
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	1138/1639	3.76	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1410/1639	3.74	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	973/1397	4.10	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	822/1583	3.94	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1168/1532	3.62	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	638/1504	3.94	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	1	1	4	3.44	1424/1612	3.81	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	884/1635	4.52	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1170/1579	3.65	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	745/1518	4.31	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.76	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	800/1517	4.09	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	0	5	3.89	1171/1550	3.77	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1295	2.38	3.42	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	708/1398	3.80	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	678/1391	4.25	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388	4.49	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	3	1	0	2	2.86	884/ 958	3.55	3.83	3.93	3.97	2.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0101
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 768
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	718/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	4.70	3.83	3.93	3.97	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	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	2
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 392 0301
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: BENSON, LINDA K
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 769
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1410/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1324/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	774/1532	3.75	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1044/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.67	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1419/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1328/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.50	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	4.70	3.83	3.93	3.97	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 Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0401
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 770
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1410/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	3.75	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1604/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	1.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	569/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1033/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1292/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	832/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1293/1295	1.00	3.42	3.94	3.95	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	4.70	3.83	3.93	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 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 0501
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 771
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1595/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Major 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Non-major 1
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 392 0601
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MABE, MITZI J
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 772
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	476/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1399/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1318/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1414/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1077/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.70	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0701
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 773
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	3.75	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1135/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	889/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	807/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	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	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0801
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 774
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1579/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.75	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	3.45	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.70	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 392 0901
 Title TUTORIAL IN WRITING
 Instructor: MCGURRIN JR, AN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 775
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1138/1639	4.54	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1639	4.04	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1532/1583	4.31	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1618/1635	4.25	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1579	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	807/1518	4.07	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	4.81	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.02	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	4.55	4.17	4.22	4.20	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	4.93	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	4.95	4.47	4.28	4.34	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	3	Non-major	2
84-150	1	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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 776
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	797/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1350/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	859/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.18	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	751/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	430/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	351/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	1316/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1135/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	5	7	4.12	818/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	1337/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	961/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1256/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1144/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	1	6	4	3.85	776/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	728/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	662/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	912/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	769/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 15
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 393 0201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 777
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	1	6	4.00	1138/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1300/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1219/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	960/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	7	2	3.62	1176/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	506/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	7	1	2	3.00	1519/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1366/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	889/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	8	2	3.77	1364/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	1222/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1256/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	1262/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	0	6	3	3.91	731/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	695/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1106/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	887/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	577/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	1	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0301
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 778
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	6	0	6	3	1	2.56	1628/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	2.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	5	3	1	2.69	1617/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	2.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	4	3	3.19	1501/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	5	2	0	2.80	1471/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	4	6	2	3.33	1303/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	5	2	6	0	2	2.47	1578/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	2.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	3	3	7	1	3.13	1617/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	4	3	3	1	0	2.09	1571/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	2.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	6	3	3	3.19	1468/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	6	3	5	2	3.19	1509/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	3.19	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	3	6	2	3.25	1424/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	6	3	1	1	2.19	1513/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	2.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	3	3	6	1	3.21	1117/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	3	3	1	0	2.50	1357/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1286/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	1343/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	2.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	725/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	13	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 12	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0401
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 779
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	6	6	6	3.59	1458/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	9	8	4.00	1090/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	11	4.23	822/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1023/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	775/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	1109/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	3	13	4	3.95	1533/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	1	1	7	11	1	3.48	1331/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	10	11	4.45	877/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	3	14	4.36	1299/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	4	5	11	4.14	999/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	6	5	7	3.64	1285/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	289/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	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 2	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	19	3.00-3.49 8	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 21	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 780
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	10	4	3.88	1266/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	748/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	2	6	3	3.83	1131/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	751/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	729/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	478/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	694/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	13	1	3.88	1572/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	11	3	4.06	853/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	947/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	648/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	405/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	944/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	1209/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	916/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1106/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1130/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.42	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	5.00	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0501
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 780
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	14
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0701
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HESS, LAURIE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 781
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	5	8	4.00	1138/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	959/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	795/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	781/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	544/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	404/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	11	4.21	860/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	1056/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	9	4	4.13	795/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	1293/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	1222/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	875/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1077/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	6	1	6	3.79	819/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 0801
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: MEADE, VICKI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 782
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	1	2	2	3	3.30	1553/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	3.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	0	2	1	5	3.70	1388/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1226/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	2	2	3.00	1421/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	1	1	3	3.11	1388/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	965/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1318/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	1318/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	1397/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	3	1	4	3.50	1347/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	4	1	3	3.30	1393/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	623/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	994/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1094/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	1	3	3.57	1165/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	798/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.29	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.48	4.04	4.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	4	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	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1001
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: HESS, LAURIE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 783
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	814/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	877/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	517/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	512/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	506/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	441/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	2	11	4.22	848/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	958/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1133/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	3	3	7	3.93	1293/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	1305/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	928/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	690/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	709/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	908/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	983/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	944/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	380/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 18 Non-major 18
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	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 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393 1101
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 784
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1082/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	774/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	767/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	476/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	655/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	544/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	617/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	6	2	3.83	1579/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	569/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	1021/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1264/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	405/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	972/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	0	1	0	2	3.00	1158/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 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 1201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: ROCKETT, DANIKA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 785
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1055/1639	3.82	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	877/1639	3.93	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1144/1397	4.08	4.25	4.28	4.26	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	751/1583	4.14	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	5	5	3.59	1195/1532	3.80	4.02	4.01	4.05	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	8	4.12	758/1504	4.12	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	589/1612	3.89	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	4	4.25	1350/1635	4.21	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	623/1579	3.78	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	1069/1518	4.00	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	872/1520	4.37	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	928/1517	4.05	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	6	3	3.71	1254/1550	3.73	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	4	2	1	3.57	943/1295	3.66	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/1398	3.88	4.20	4.07	4.13	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1391	4.03	4.39	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/1388	3.91	4.47	4.28	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	3.64	3.83	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	17
84-150	1	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	12
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 786
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	508/1639	4.66	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	415/1639	4.80	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	597/1583	4.45	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1532	4.86	4.02	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	4.86	4.30	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	4.86	3.88	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	4.71	4.32	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	382/1579	4.65	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	4.93	4.30	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	474/1517	4.66	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.76	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	838/1295	3.48	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.63	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	4.80	4.39	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	4.90	4.47	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.53	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.27	4.58	4.50	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	3.65	4.52	4.59	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	3.70	4.47	4.60	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	3.97	4.47	4.65	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 82	4.50	3.64	4.16	4.08	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	32/ 52	4.00	4.48	4.04	4.78	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	4.18	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 42	4.50	4.42	4.75	4.63	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	3.80	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.00	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	5.00	4.45	5.00	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	5.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	5.00	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.37	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 21	5.00	5.00	4.52	5.00	5.00	

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0201
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: SLYTHOMPSON, AL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 786
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	5
84-150	2	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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 393E 0301
 Title TECHNICAL WRITING
 Instructor: SINGH, YASHODA
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 787
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	366/1639	4.66	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	4.80	4.09	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.58	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	476/1583	4.45	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	203/1532	4.86	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	208/1504	4.86	4.30	4.05	4.12	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	259/1612	4.86	3.88	4.16	4.12	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1215/1635	4.71	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1579	4.65	4.05	4.08	4.07	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.93	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	347/1517	4.66	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	401/1550	4.76	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1122/1295	3.48	3.42	3.94	3.95	3.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.63	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	4.80	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.90	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	267/ 958	4.53	3.83	3.93	3.97	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 394 0101
 Title TECHNICAL EDITING
 Instructor: HARRIS, LINDA R (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 788
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1630/1639	2.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	2.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1613/1639	2.75	4.09	4.22	4.20	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1406/1583	3.50	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1516/1532	2.25	4.02	4.01	4.05	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1340/1504	3.25	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1618/1635	3.00	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1390/1579	3.33	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1419/1518	3.25	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1465/1520	3.38	4.71	4.70	4.68	3.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1424/1517	3.13	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1440/1550	2.50	4.17	4.22	4.20	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	3.00	1158/1295	2.50	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1130/1388	3.67	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	951/ 958	1.00	3.83	3.93	3.97	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 394 0101
 Title TECHNICAL EDITING
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 789
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	1630/1639	2.50	4.05	4.27	4.28	2.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1613/1639	2.75	4.09	4.22	4.20	2.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.25	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1406/1583	3.50	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1516/1532	2.25	4.02	4.01	4.05	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1340/1504	3.25	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1618/1635	3.00	4.32	4.65	4.66	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1481/1518	3.25	4.30	4.43	4.39	3.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1512/1520	3.38	4.71	4.70	4.68	3.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1453/1517	3.13	4.24	4.27	4.23	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	2.50	4.17	4.22	4.20	2.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	2.50	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1130/1388	3.67	4.47	4.28	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	951/ 958	1.00	3.83	3.93	3.97	1.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: HICKERNELL, MAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 790
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	990/1639	4.17	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1205/1583	3.83	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	714/1532	4.08	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	932/1504	3.92	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1229/1612	3.83	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.92	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	1208/1579	3.80	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1141/1518	4.23	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	992/1520	4.54	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	947/1517	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1297/1550	3.61	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1247/1295	2.50	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	25/ 52	4.73	4.48	4.04	4.78	4.73	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	29/ 53	4.18	4.18	4.05	4.31	4.18	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	3	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	36/ 42	4.38	4.42	4.75	4.63	4.38	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	1	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	34/ 37	3.80	3.80	4.58	4.52	3.80	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	3	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	26/ 32	4.00	4.00	4.56	4.30	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 395 0101
 Title WRITING INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: FITZPATRICK, CA (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 791
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	990/1639	4.17	4.05	4.27	4.28	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	948/1639	4.17	4.09	4.22	4.20	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1205/1583	3.83	4.22	4.19	4.24	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	714/1532	4.08	4.02	4.01	4.05	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	932/1504	3.92	4.30	4.05	4.12	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1229/1612	3.83	3.88	4.16	4.12	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	595/1635	4.92	4.32	4.65	4.66	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1056/1579	3.80	4.05	4.08	4.07	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1094/1518	4.23	4.30	4.43	4.39	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	1292/1520	4.54	4.71	4.70	4.68	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1007/1517	4.16	4.24	4.27	4.23	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1289/1550	3.61	4.17	4.22	4.20	3.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1247/1295	2.50	3.42	3.94	3.95	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.20	4.07	4.13	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.39	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	3.83	3.93	3.97	3.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	25/ 52	4.73	4.48	4.04	4.78	4.73	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	29/ 53	4.18	4.18	4.05	4.31	4.18	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	3	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	36/ 42	4.38	4.42	4.75	4.63	4.38	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	1	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	34/ 37	3.80	3.80	4.58	4.52	3.80	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	3	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	26/ 32	4.00	4.00	4.56	4.30	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0101
 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI
 Instructor: BERMAN, JESSICA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 792
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1639	4.68	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	349/1639	4.72	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	282/1397	4.82	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	173/1583	4.86	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	236/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	182/1504	4.71	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	718/1612	4.33	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1350/1635	4.40	4.32	4.65	4.72	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	332/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1518	4.73	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	4.83	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	833/1517	4.15	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	424/1550	4.57	4.17	4.22	4.24	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	825/1295	3.89	3.42	3.94	4.01	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	489/1391	4.83	4.39	4.30	4.48	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	496/1388	4.83	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	786/ 958	3.94	3.83	3.93	4.24	3.33	

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

Course-Section: ENGL 401 0201
 Title METHOD OF INTERPRETATI
 Instructor: STEWART, CAROLE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 793
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	698/1639	4.68	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	231/1639	4.72	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	175/1397	4.82	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	151/1583	4.86	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	165/1532	4.72	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	245/1504	4.71	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	718/1612	4.33	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1101/1635	4.40	4.32	4.65	4.72	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	691/1579	4.39	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	602/1518	4.73	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1033/1520	4.83	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.15	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	716/1550	4.57	4.17	4.22	4.24	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	623/1295	3.89	3.42	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	560/1398	4.33	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1391	4.83	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1388	4.83	4.47	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	190/ 958	3.94	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.56	

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 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	5	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	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 405 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN LITERARY HI
 Instructor: FALCO, RAPHAEL
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 794
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1274/1639	3.89	4.09	4.22	4.29	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	****	4.25	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1247/1583	3.78	4.22	4.19	4.31	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	165/1532	4.78	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1034/1504	3.78	4.30	4.05	4.20	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	1	1	3	3.33	1455/1612	3.33	3.88	4.16	4.18	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.32	4.65	4.72	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1520	****	4.71	4.70	4.75	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1517	****	4.24	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1550	****	4.17	4.22	4.24	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.39	4.30	4.48	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	3.83	3.93	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	40/ 85	4.86	4.27	4.58	4.83	4.86	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	36/ 82	4.75	3.65	4.52	4.49	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	66/ 78	3.88	3.70	4.47	4.56	3.88	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	51/ 80	4.38	3.97	4.47	4.59	4.38	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	1	3	1	1	1	2.71	74/ 82	2.71	3.64	4.16	4.02	2.71	

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	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ENGL 407 0101
 Title LANGUAGE IN SOCIETY
 Instructor: SHIPKA, JODY
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 795
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	281/1639	4.79	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	295/1639	4.71	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	203/1532	4.71	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	163/1504	4.79	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	996/1612	4.07	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	943/1635	4.71	4.32	4.65	4.72	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	283/1579	4.60	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	156/1550	4.92	4.17	4.22	4.24	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.42	3.94	4.01	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.20	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	533/1388	4.64	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	75/ 958	4.90	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.90	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.02	****	

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	9	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	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: ENGL 448 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN LIT & CULTU
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 796
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1639	4.92	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	316/1639	4.69	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.25	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	168/1583	4.85	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	84/1532	4.92	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	283/1504	4.62	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.62	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	207/1612	4.77	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	1056/1635	4.62	4.32	4.65	4.72	4.62	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	137/1579	4.80	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	191/1518	4.92	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	141/1517	4.92	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.17	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	398/1295	4.33	3.42	3.94	4.01	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.90	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	190/ 958	4.56	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.56	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 471 0101
 Title ADV CREATIVE WRTNG:FIC
 Instructor: ROWELL, JOHN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 797
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	561/1639	4.56	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	722/1397	4.33	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	113/1532	4.89	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	169/1504	4.78	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	669/1612	4.38	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	720/1518	4.57	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.71	4.70	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.17	4.22	4.24	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	894/1295	3.67	3.42	3.94	4.01	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	172/1398	4.89	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.39	4.30	4.48	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.25	

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 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 10 Non-major 4
84-150	1	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 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ENGL 486 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN TEACHING CO
 Instructor: MCCARTHY, LUCIL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 798
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	366/1639	4.71	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	445/1639	4.57	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1583	4.86	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.02	4.01	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	544/1504	4.33	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	913/1612	4.17	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1579	4.83	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.24	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.20	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	296/1388	4.83	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ENGL 490 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS IN ENGL LAN
 Instructor: ORGELFINGER, GA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 799
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.05	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.09	4.22	4.29	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	447/1397	4.57	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1583	4.86	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.02	4.01	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1504	4.86	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	603/1612	4.43	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.32	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.05	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1518	4.86	4.30	4.43	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.17	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	346/1295	4.40	3.42	3.94	4.01	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.39	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	3.83	3.93	4.24	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	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 0
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 493 0101
 Title SEMINAR IN CT
 Instructor: BURGESS, HELEN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 800
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	293/1639	4.78	4.05	4.27	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.09	4.22	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1397	4.86	4.25	4.28	4.38	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1583	4.78	4.22	4.19	4.31	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	165/1532	4.78	4.02	4.01	4.07	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	329/1504	4.56	4.30	4.05	4.20	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	848/1612	4.22	3.88	4.16	4.18	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1576/1635	3.86	4.32	4.65	4.72	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	116/1579	4.88	4.05	4.08	4.21	4.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.30	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.71	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	231/1550	4.86	4.17	4.22	4.24	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.42	3.94	4.01	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	260/1398	4.75	4.20	4.07	4.23	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.39	4.30	4.48	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.88	4.47	4.28	4.50	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	179/ 958	4.60	3.83	3.93	4.24	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.27	4.58	4.83	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.65	4.52	4.49	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	3.70	4.47	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	3.97	4.47	4.59	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.64	4.16	4.02	****	

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 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	2	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	Other	7
			? 0		