

Course-Section: LLC 616 0101
 Title CYBERSPACE CULTURE & S
 Instructor: MALONEY-KRICHMA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 969
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	549/1504	4.50	4.65	4.27	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.57	4.20	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.43	4.28	4.36	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	752/1453	4.27	4.57	4.21	4.34	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	158/1421	4.75	4.70	4.00	4.27	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	493/1365	4.33	4.60	4.08	4.35	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	577/1485	4.42	4.60	4.16	4.24	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	591/1504	4.92	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	635/1483	4.25	4.49	4.06	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	1036/1425	4.25	4.13	4.41	4.51	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	1128/1426	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	1	4	6	4.17	930/1418	4.17	4.32	4.25	4.36	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	701/1416	4.44	4.55	4.26	4.38	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	429/1199	4.33	4.18	3.97	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	215/1312	4.73	4.65	4.00	4.31	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1303	4.82	4.89	4.24	4.58	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	293/1299	4.82	4.91	4.25	4.56	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.47	4.01	4.24	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	****	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 70	****	4.25	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	****	4.75	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.41	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.55	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.37	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.46	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	36	****	****	4.60	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	20	****	****	4.24	3.16	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/	16	****	****	4.51	4.40	****

Course-Section: LLC 616 0101
 Title CYBERSPACE CULTURE & S
 Instructor: MALONEY-KRICHMA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 969
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LLC 635 0101
 Title SOC CULT LRNG THEOR
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 970
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	239/1504	4.78	4.65	4.27	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.57	4.20	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.43	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.57	4.21	4.34	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.70	4.00	4.27	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	493/1365	4.33	4.60	4.08	4.35	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.60	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	668/1483	4.22	4.49	4.06	4.20	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.13	4.41	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	0	3.78	1154/1418	3.78	4.32	4.25	4.36	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.55	4.26	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	876/1199	3.63	4.18	3.97	4.04	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.65	4.00	4.31	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.89	4.24	4.58	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	333/1299	4.78	4.91	4.25	4.56	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.47	4.01	4.24	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750A 0101
 Title SOCIOCULTURAL CONTEXTS
 Instructor: BROOKS, WANDA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 971
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.65	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.57	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.43	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	194/1453	4.75	4.57	4.21	4.34	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.70	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.60	4.08	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.60	4.16	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.49	4.06	4.20	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	4.65	4.00	4.31	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.89	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.91	4.25	4.56	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.47	4.01	4.24	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750C 0101
 Title AMERICA THROUGH EYES O
 Instructor: GWIAZDA, PIOTR
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 972
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.57	4.20	4.28	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.43	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.57	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.70	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.60	4.08	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.60	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.49	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.13	4.41	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.32	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.55	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	495/1199	4.25	4.18	3.97	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.65	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.89	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.91	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.47	4.01	4.24	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	54/ 70	4.25	4.25	4.35	4.21	4.25
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	29/ 67	4.75	4.75	4.34	4.48	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	31/ 73	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.15	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750E 0101
 Title TOPICS IN LLC
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 973
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.65	4.27	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.57	4.20	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.43	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.57	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.70	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.60	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.60	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.49	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1308/1425	3.50	4.13	4.41	4.51	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.33	4.32	4.25	4.36	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.55	4.26	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.18	3.97	4.04	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.65	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.89	4.24	4.58	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.91	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.47	4.01	4.24	4.67

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	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LLC 750E 0101
 Title TOPICS IN LLC
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 974
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.65	4.27	4.44	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.57	4.20	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.43	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.57	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.70	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1365	4.50	4.60	4.08	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.60	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.75
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1319/1426	4.50	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1013/1418	4.33	4.32	4.25	4.36	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.65	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.89	4.24	4.58	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.91	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	132/ 758	4.67	4.47	4.01	4.24	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 890 0101
 Title RES PROPOSAL SEMINAR
 Instructor: WALLACE, KENDRA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 975
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.65	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.57	4.20	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.57	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.70	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.60	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.60	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	4.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.65	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.89	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.91	4.25	4.56	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	1	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	0	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						