

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	5	0	5	9	22	33	39	3.85	1311/1649	3.98	4.30	4.28	4.11	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	7	14	26	40	21	3.50	1481/1648	3.85	4.18	4.23	4.16	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	11	15	23	26	31	3.48	1215/1375	3.77	4.18	4.27	4.10	3.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	25	6	14	15	23	24	3.55	1387/1595	3.72	4.16	4.20	4.03	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	5	6	4	17	24	51	4.08	768/1533	4.19	4.18	4.04	3.87	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	36	7	16	18	19	12	3.18	1399/1512	3.58	4.05	4.10	3.86	3.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	3	8	21	31	45	3.99	1044/1623	4.16	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.99	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	2	0	0	4	3	98	4.90	680/1646	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	0	7	13	35	27	6	3.14	1480/1621	3.66	4.06	4.06	3.96	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	8	13	31	34	19	3.41	1481/1568	4.08	4.46	4.43	4.39	3.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	7	21	76	4.60	1146/1572	4.61	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	6	18	26	24	28	3.49	1391/1564	3.93	4.31	4.28	4.20	3.49	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	2	14	10	24	22	32	3.47	1381/1559	3.90	4.36	4.29	4.20	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	6	11	19	27	37	3.78	893/1352	4.13	4.17	3.98	3.86	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	47	0	11	9	13	18	15	3.26	1192/1384	3.49	4.05	4.08	3.86	3.26	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	7	4	15	14	26	3.73	1116/1382	3.74	4.28	4.29	4.03	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	7	4	13	17	25	3.74	1100/1368	3.91	4.34	4.30	4.01	3.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	47	9	10	3	11	16	17	3.47	713/ 948	3.64	3.93	3.95	3.75	3.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	102	2	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	103	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	103	4	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	104	2	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	100	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	104	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	104	3	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	105	3	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	106	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	104	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	107	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	107	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	107	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	107	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	106	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	105	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	104	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	104	2	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	104	2	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	99	2	1	1	1	6	3	3.75	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 206
 Questionnaires: 113

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1375
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	19	0.00-0.99	1	A	43	Required for Majors	47	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	33						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	9	General	16	Under-grad	113	Non-major	102
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 212
 Questionnaires: 138

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1376
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	4	10	28	39	49	3.92	1263/1649	3.98	4.30	4.28	4.11	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	8	0	4	6	29	43	48	3.96	1166/1648	3.85	4.18	4.23	4.16	3.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	7	6	26	45	46	3.90	1034/1375	3.77	4.18	4.27	4.10	3.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	27	8	9	21	34	31	3.69	1323/1595	3.72	4.16	4.20	4.03	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	2	5	7	14	29	72	4.23	653/1533	4.19	4.18	4.04	3.87	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	44	9	5	20	29	23	3.60	1202/1512	3.58	4.05	4.10	3.86	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	2	1	10	14	39	62	4.20	883/1623	4.16	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	1	0	0	0	5	124	4.96	266/1646	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	30	1	3	4	35	50	15	3.65	1268/1621	3.66	4.06	4.06	3.96	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	1	4	10	31	83	4.48	878/1568	4.08	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	1	3	13	29	84	4.48	1265/1572	4.61	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.48	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	2	8	23	40	55	4.08	1096/1564	3.93	4.31	4.28	4.20	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	13	13	37	62	4.11	1075/1559	3.90	4.36	4.29	4.20	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	2	2	2	11	30	79	4.47	341/1352	4.13	4.17	3.98	3.86	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	66	0	11	5	15	27	14	3.39	1132/1384	3.49	4.05	4.08	3.86	3.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	68	0	7	9	18	16	20	3.47	1221/1382	3.74	4.28	4.29	4.03	3.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	69	0	7	5	17	12	28	3.71	1115/1368	3.91	4.34	4.30	4.01	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	70	10	4	3	17	19	15	3.66	651/ 948	3.64	3.93	3.95	3.75	3.66	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	123	2	0	2	1	1	9	4.31	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	123	0	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	123	2	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	123	9	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	115	6	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	130	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	130	5	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	130	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	130	4	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	115	4	0	1	1	17	0	3.84	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	130	0	3	1	1	3	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	130	0	2	1	2	3	0	2.75	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	130	5	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	130	6	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	129	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	128	0	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	129	3	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	128	5	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	129	4	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	107	2	0	3	3	22	1	3.72	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 212
 Questionnaires: 138

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1376
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	27	0.00-0.99	7	A	63	Required for Majors	54	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	1	B	29						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	9	General	14	Under-grad	138	Non-major	130
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	34				
				?	3						

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J
 Enrollment: 176
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1377
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	2	14	21	33	4.17	1057/1649	3.98	4.30	4.28	4.11	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	5	11	28	27	4.08	1076/1648	3.85	4.18	4.23	4.16	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	6	15	28	22	3.93	1017/1375	3.77	4.18	4.27	4.10	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	12	1	7	10	19	22	3.92	1188/1595	3.72	4.16	4.20	4.03	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	2	2	8	20	35	4.25	624/1533	4.19	4.18	4.04	3.87	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	20	3	3	6	20	18	3.94	966/1512	3.58	4.05	4.10	3.86	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	11	21	36	4.29	780/1623	4.16	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	2	67	4.97	199/1646	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	3	0	1	10	20	23	4.20	743/1621	3.66	4.06	4.06	3.96	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	8	23	35	4.34	1050/1568	4.08	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	14	53	4.74	967/1572	4.61	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	11	25	30	4.22	971/1564	3.93	4.31	4.28	4.20	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	8	31	26	4.12	1067/1559	3.90	4.36	4.29	4.20	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	3	10	23	29	4.15	590/1352	4.13	4.17	3.98	3.86	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	10	0	5	21	24	3.82	931/1384	3.49	4.05	4.08	3.86	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	5	2	6	21	26	4.02	943/1382	3.74	4.28	4.29	4.03	4.02	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	4	1	5	15	35	4.27	838/1368	3.91	4.34	4.30	4.01	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	14	3	4	7	18	14	3.78	587/ 948	3.64	3.93	3.95	3.75	3.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	67	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	67	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	67	2	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	67	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	68	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	68	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	68	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	68	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	69	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	69	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	69	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	69	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	69	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	69	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	69	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	1	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J
 Enrollment: 176
 Questionnaires: 73

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1377
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	14	0.00-0.99	2	A	19	Required for Majors	33	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	14	General	7	Under-grad	73	Non-major	65
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	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	4	14	25	33	4.03	1169/1649	4.29	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	7	20	19	32	3.94	1197/1648	4.21	4.18	4.23	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	5	9	15	25	24	3.69	1141/1375	4.07	4.18	4.27	4.37	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	5	7	15	22	21	3.67	1329/1595	3.93	4.16	4.20	4.22	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	4	4	12	19	34	4.03	801/1533	4.37	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	10	12	15	20	16	3.27	1367/1512	3.71	4.05	4.10	4.14	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	11	15	49	4.40	647/1623	4.46	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	71	4.90	680/1646	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	4	1	5	16	35	8	3.68	1254/1621	4.09	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	17	55	4.57	779/1568	4.49	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	5	6	67	4.76	931/1572	4.80	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	6	10	19	43	4.27	929/1564	4.33	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3	6	19	45	4.19	1016/1559	4.27	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	3	4	19	46	4.41	399/1352	4.45	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	7	4	14	15	22	3.66	1011/1384	3.98	4.05	4.08	3.99	3.66	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	3	5	18	36	4.35	765/1382	4.43	4.28	4.29	4.19	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	3	5	15	39	4.45	703/1368	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	48	2	1	5	3	3	3.29	****/ 948	3.98	3.93	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	77	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.47	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	76	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	74	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	77	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	3.67	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	74	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	77	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.05	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	69	1	0	1	0	8	0	3.78	****/ 110	3.77	4.04	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	3	A	20	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	1	Major	33
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	30						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	20	General	10	Under-grad	78	Non-major	46
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	43				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0201
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 97
 Questionnaires: 50

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1379
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	13	32	4.50	644/1649	4.29	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	16	26	4.28	862/1648	4.21	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	20	23	4.24	823/1375	4.07	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	2	3	7	5	17	3.94	1148/1595	3.93	4.16	4.20	4.22	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	8	35	4.57	311/1533	4.37	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	16	2	5	8	7	12	3.65	1180/1512	3.71	4.05	4.10	4.14	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	16	30	4.52	480/1623	4.46	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	12	36	4.71	977/1646	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	7	14	18	4.22	720/1621	4.09	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	3	12	30	4.42	969/1568	4.49	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	6	40	4.79	858/1572	4.80	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	4	4	12	27	4.25	939/1564	4.33	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	2	9	30	4.25	966/1559	4.27	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	3	3	9	31	4.40	399/1352	4.45	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	5	5	11	4.18	714/1384	3.98	4.05	4.08	3.99	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	2	1	5	14	4.41	716/1382	4.43	4.28	4.29	4.19	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	358/1368	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	5	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	667/ 948	3.98	3.93	3.95	3.89	3.63	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	47	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	1	0	0	12	0	3.77	88/ 110	3.77	4.04	3.99	3.72	3.77	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	14
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 0	B 21		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 1	General	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 8	D 1		Under-grad 50
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0401
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J
 Enrollment: 94
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1380
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	11	38	4.36	844/1649	4.29	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	15	36	4.42	672/1648	4.21	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	15	32	4.29	780/1375	4.07	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	6	6	15	27	4.17	930/1595	3.93	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	7	43	4.52	358/1533	4.37	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	5	11	34	4.21	735/1512	3.71	4.05	4.10	4.14	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	1	17	36	4.45	581/1623	4.46	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	54	4.93	465/1646	4.85	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	5	15	28	4.38	535/1621	4.09	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	3	4	5	44	4.48	878/1568	4.49	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	51	4.85	740/1572	4.80	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	3	4	10	41	4.47	689/1564	4.33	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	3	12	38	4.36	881/1559	4.27	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	4	12	38	4.54	286/1352	4.45	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	3	2	6	7	23	4.10	764/1384	3.98	4.05	4.08	3.99	4.10
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	1	3	6	30	4.54	593/1382	4.43	4.28	4.29	4.19	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	13	27	4.63	550/1368	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	1	1	5	7	22	4.33	310/ 948	3.98	3.93	3.95	3.89	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	54	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	54	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	54	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	55	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	54	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	54	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	54	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	51	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	****/ 110	3.77	4.04	3.99	3.72	****

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0401
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J
 Enrollment: 94
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1380
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	1	Major	20
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	5	Under-grad	58	Non-major	39
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 205 0101
 Title BEFORE WE WERE BORN
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1381
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	186/1649	4.90	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	498/1648	4.55	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	15	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	133/1595	4.90	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	327/1533	4.55	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.05	4.10	4.14	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	15	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	398/1646	4.95	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	483/1621	4.42	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	147/1568	4.95	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	310/1564	4.78	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	123/1559	4.95	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	104/1352	4.89	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	673/1384	4.25	4.05	4.08	3.99	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	899/1382	4.14	4.28	4.29	4.19	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	3.89	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	9	Under-grad	20	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: BORRERO, JOHN
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1382
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	13	41	4.67	433/1649	4.29	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	44	4.77	253/1648	4.52	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	9	44	4.70	360/1375	4.39	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	18	1	2	7	4	25	4.28	782/1595	4.09	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	6	6	10	13	19	3.61	1173/1533	3.61	4.18	4.04	4.04	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	36	2	1	3	3	11	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.05	4.10	4.14	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	3	50	4.85	145/1623	4.81	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	40	4.73	961/1646	4.86	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	2	8	36	4.74	178/1621	4.37	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	50	4.93	196/1568	4.82	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	50	4.94	355/1572	4.82	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	3	5	45	4.79	278/1564	4.52	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	3	47	4.87	250/1559	4.51	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	11	41	4.74	167/1352	4.24	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	424/1384	4.31	4.05	4.08	3.99	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1382	4.43	4.28	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	132/1368	4.64	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.95	
4. Were special techniques successful	35	11	3	0	0	3	5	3.64	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	49	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	54	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	55	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	55	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	12	1	4.08	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: BORRERO, JOHN
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1382
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	34	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	57	Non-major	30
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0201
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1383
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	4	12	13	3.91	1263/1649	4.29	4.30	4.28	4.29	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	0	6	5	21	4.26	885/1648	4.52	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	3	2	6	20	4.09	922/1375	4.39	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	2	2	3	3	11	3.90	1202/1595	4.09	4.16	4.20	4.22	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	3	8	6	11	3.61	1173/1533	3.61	4.18	4.04	4.04	3.61	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/1512	4.00	4.05	4.10	4.14	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	220/1623	4.81	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1646	4.86	4.69	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	5	11	7	4.00	914/1621	4.37	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	4	26	4.72	554/1568	4.82	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	5	25	4.69	1046/1572	4.82	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	2	6	20	4.25	939/1564	4.52	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	4	1	1	5	20	4.16	1031/1559	4.51	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.16	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	3	3	5	4	13	3.75	914/1352	4.24	4.17	3.98	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	3	2	13	4.10	764/1384	4.31	4.05	4.08	3.99	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	3	3	2	12	3.86	1046/1382	4.43	4.28	4.29	4.19	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	1	1	2	16	4.32	809/1368	4.64	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	15	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	3.89	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	1	0	0	3	0	3.25	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0201
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S
 Enrollment: 77
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1383
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	35	Non-major	20
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 215 0101
 Title PARAPROFESSIONAL RES C
 Instructor: LEISEY, KIM
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1384
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	10	13	4.03	1162/1649	4.03	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	9	16	4.30	839/1648	4.30	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	6	8	14	4.17	868/1375	4.17	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	14	12	4.28	794/1595	4.28	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	10	14	4.17	703/1533	4.17	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	15	9	4.07	854/1512	4.07	4.05	4.10	4.14	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	10	15	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	266/1646	4.97	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	17	8	4.27	676/1621	4.27	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	699/1568	4.62	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	931/1572	4.76	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	580/1564	4.57	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	9	19	4.62	561/1559	4.62	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	2	12	12	4.18	573/1352	4.18	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	673/1384	4.25	4.05	4.08	3.99	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	521/1382	4.63	4.28	4.29	4.19	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	295/1368	4.88	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	293/ 948	4.38	3.93	3.95	3.89	4.38	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	28	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	29
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 215 0201
 Title Paraprofessional Res Com
 Instructor: (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 16
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	523/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	336/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	9	12	4.45	605/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	566/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	8	6	3.77	1045/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	10	8	4.09	839/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	296/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	497/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	245/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	815/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	310/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	205/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	5	7	8	4.15	590/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	23	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 215 0201
 Title Paraprofessional Res Com
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 17
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	523/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	336/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	9	12	4.45	605/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	566/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	8	6	3.77	1045/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	10	8	4.09	839/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	16	4.68	296/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	5	8	1	3.71	1225/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	0	2	2	11	4.38	1012/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	1	1	0	6	8	4.19	1422/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	0	3	1	11	4.31	876/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	662/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	650/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	175/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: LENNON, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1385
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1649	4.63	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	336/1648	4.69	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	380/1375	4.69	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	594/1595	4.44	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	319/1533	4.56	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	13	4.56	338/1512	4.56	4.05	4.10	4.14	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1447/1646	4.19	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	835/1621	4.13	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	171/1568	4.94	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	414/1572	4.94	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	197/1564	4.88	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	306/1559	4.81	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	142/1352	4.79	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	520/1384	4.43	4.05	4.08	3.99	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.93	3.95	3.89	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.72	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 216 0101
 Title FOUNDATIONS OF LEADERS
 Instructor: LENNON, NICHOLA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1385
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	16	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1386
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	12	19	4.47	683/1649	4.55	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	11	16	4.15	1021/1648	4.38	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	3	13	13	4.06	929/1375	4.36	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	6	8	15	4.03	1049/1595	4.30	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	8	7	16	4.09	754/1533	4.26	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	5	8	8	7	3.21	1391/1512	3.77	4.05	4.10	4.14	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	9	21	4.44	581/1623	4.62	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	31	4.91	597/1646	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	4	17	4	3.81	1141/1621	4.24	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	6	25	4.56	791/1568	4.57	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	876/1572	4.81	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	0	1	7	23	4.48	676/1564	4.51	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	22	4.53	673/1559	4.60	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	3	27	4.67	208/1352	4.51	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	1	3	7	15	3.93	858/1384	3.88	4.05	4.08	3.99	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	3	3	2	11	12	3.84	1057/1382	3.98	4.28	4.29	4.19	3.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	2	3	7	17	4.13	910/1368	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	6	3	2	3	7	3.10	836/ 948	3.02	3.93	3.95	3.89	3.10
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.64	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	****/ 555	4.76	4.83	4.29	4.33	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	3.66	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	16	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.72	4.00

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1386
 FEB 11, 2009
 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 12	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 11		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 7	General 6	Under-grad 34 Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 6	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0201
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1387
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	4	29	4.77	306/1649	4.55	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	8	28	4.78	244/1648	4.38	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	219/1375	4.36	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	2	8	20	4.60	383/1595	4.30	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	2	7	23	4.28	604/1533	4.26	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	5	8	16	4.09	839/1512	3.77	4.05	4.10	4.14	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	109/1623	4.62	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	35	1	4.03	1536/1646	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.03	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	26	4.81	133/1621	4.24	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	30	4.80	387/1568	4.57	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	32	4.89	640/1572	4.81	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	6	26	4.71	422/1564	4.51	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	32	4.89	227/1559	4.60	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	1	32	4.78	147/1352	4.51	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	778/1384	3.88	4.05	4.08	3.99	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	2	4	4	7	3.94	997/1382	3.98	4.28	4.29	4.19	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	1	0	2	4	10	4.29	821/1368	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	8	2	1	0	1	5	3.67	****/ 948	3.02	3.93	3.95	3.89	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	37	Non-major	29
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0301
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1388
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	41	4.79	295/1649	4.55	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	35	4.66	375/1648	4.38	4.18	4.23	4.25	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	12	31	4.57	496/1375	4.36	4.18	4.27	4.37	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	18	2	0	1	4	21	4.50	497/1595	4.30	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	4	10	29	4.47	410/1533	4.26	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	21	1	3	1	4	14	4.17	773/1512	3.77	4.05	4.10	4.14	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	8	35	4.73	241/1623	4.62	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	44	5.00	1/1646	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	3	14	24	4.51	365/1621	4.24	4.06	4.06	4.01	4.51	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	6	36	4.75	480/1568	4.57	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	41	4.91	591/1572	4.81	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	5	36	4.75	342/1564	4.51	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	6	37	4.80	332/1559	4.60	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	6	11	25	4.40	407/1352	4.51	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	2	1	7	19	4.37	582/1384	3.88	4.05	4.08	3.99	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	4	24	4.73	414/1382	3.98	4.28	4.29	4.19	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	337/1368	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.21	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	16	3	0	4	4	3	3.29	793/ 948	3.02	3.93	3.95	3.89	3.29	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	4.76	4.83	4.29	4.33	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	44	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	17
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	9	Under-grad	46	Non-major	30
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0401
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ARNHEIM, DANIEL
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1389
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	7	10	17	4.17	1057/1649	4.55	4.30	4.28	4.29	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	8	16	10	3.94	1187/1648	4.38	4.18	4.23	4.25	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	10	15	3.97	975/1375	4.36	4.18	4.27	4.37	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	3	4	11	12	4.07	1032/1595	4.30	4.16	4.20	4.22	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	7	14	14	4.20	680/1533	4.26	4.18	4.04	4.04	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	10	7	10	3.61	1202/1512	3.77	4.05	4.10	4.14	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	5	5	23	4.40	635/1623	4.62	4.30	4.16	4.21	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	929/1646	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.63	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	1	5	13	3	3.82	1141/1621	4.24	4.06	4.06	4.01	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	4	15	12	4.19	1176/1568	4.57	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.19	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	1071/1572	4.81	4.72	4.70	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	7	12	12	4.09	1087/1564	4.51	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	5	11	15	4.18	1016/1559	4.60	4.36	4.29	4.33	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	2	4	9	17	4.18	565/1352	4.51	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	5	3	6	7	5	3.15	1228/1384	3.88	4.05	4.08	3.99	3.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	4	10	1	9	3.42	1229/1382	3.98	4.28	4.29	4.19	3.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	2	6	7	9	3.73	1105/1368	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.21	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	17	2	2	3	1	1	2.67	901/ 948	3.02	3.93	3.95	3.89	2.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.62	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.64	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	1	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	249/ 555	4.76	4.83	4.29	4.33	4.76	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	3.66	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	1	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	2	0	0	0	16	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.72	4.00	

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0401
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ARNHEIM, DANIEL
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1389
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	36	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	4	15	55	4.65	446/1649	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	17	53	4.66	362/1648	4.50	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	21	47	4.58	488/1375	4.74	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	36	1	1	5	6	26	4.41	622/1595	4.49	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.41	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	2	6	12	52	4.58	303/1533	4.51	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	51	1	0	1	3	17	4.59	317/1512	4.50	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	8	11	55	4.64	358/1623	4.55	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	21	54	4.72	977/1646	4.78	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	3	21	37	4.56	331/1621	4.41	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	8	62	4.81	387/1568	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	72	4.97	178/1572	4.81	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	13	57	4.74	374/1564	4.59	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	7	61	4.73	434/1559	4.60	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	4	12	52	4.65	214/1352	4.35	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	4	1	9	4	19	3.89	891/1384	4.15	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	2	0	4	8	23	4.35	757/1382	4.53	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	1	0	2	6	28	4.62	560/1368	4.61	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	39	23	1	2	1	2	8	4.00	****/ 948	4.44	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	71	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	73	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	73	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	75	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	72	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	74	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	74	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	74	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	73	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	74	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	74	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	1	1	1	0	8	1	3.64	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 304 0101
 Title ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 150
 Questionnaires: 76

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1390
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	33	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	42
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	25						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	17	Under-grad	76	Non-major	34
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 304 8620
 Title ADOLESCENT PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1391
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	2	0	0	5	17	4.46	710/1649	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	11	0	2	0	0	7	14	4.35	784/1648	4.50	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	13	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	166/1375	4.74	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	1	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	428/1595	4.49	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	1	1	0	2	5	15	4.43	443/1533	4.51	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	0	0	6	16	4.42	507/1512	4.50	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	1	1	1	4	17	4.46	568/1623	4.55	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	782/1646	4.78	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	2	0	0	3	10	4.27	676/1621	4.41	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	3	0	1	3	16	4.26	1112/1568	4.53	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	1	0	1	20	4.65	1084/1572	4.81	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	0	2	1	18	4.43	741/1564	4.59	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	1	2	18	4.48	736/1559	4.60	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	2	2	1	2	5	11	4.05	667/1352	4.35	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	1	0	1	16	4.40	541/1384	4.15	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	455/1382	4.53	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	2	0	17	4.60	579/1368	4.61	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	14	2	2	0	0	2	14	4.44	249/ 948	4.44	3.93	3.95	4.00	4.44
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	34	Non-major	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 308 0101
 Title CHILD MALTREATMENT
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 54
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1392
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	3	10	8	11	3.53	1492/1649	3.53	4.30	4.28	4.27	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	6	13	7	10	3.58	1454/1648	3.58	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	6	9	10	7	3.28	1275/1375	3.28	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	11	8	10	3.57	1379/1595	3.57	4.16	4.20	4.21	3.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	10	10	9	3.53	1235/1533	3.53	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	6	10	4	8	3.41	1314/1512	3.41	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	11	8	15	3.94	1119/1623	3.94	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	199/1646	4.97	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	2	12	9	4	3.38	1415/1621	3.38	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	6	5	21	4.32	1060/1568	4.32	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	8	22	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	7	12	12	4.03	1113/1564	4.03	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	4	14	10	3.76	1270/1559	3.76	4.36	4.29	4.23	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	4	2	6	9	7	3.46	1069/1352	3.46	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	2	2	6	9	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	3	0	7	10	4.20	869/1382	4.20	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	2	0	8	10	4.30	816/1368	4.30	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	569/ 948	3.82	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.82	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	9	Under-grad	36	Non-major	11
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 317 0101
 Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1393
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	2	4	8	12	4.15	1067/1649	4.15	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	5	12	6	3.81	1313/1648	3.81	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	4	4	9	8	3.73	1122/1375	3.73	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	8	11	5	3.73	1295/1595	3.73	4.16	4.20	4.21	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	12	9	4.08	761/1533	4.08	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	3	6	5	6	3.45	1293/1512	3.45	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	2	6	9	6	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	2	16	5	3	3.35	1640/1646	3.35	4.69	4.69	4.67	3.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	5	12	4	3.86	1096/1621	3.86	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	6	7	11	4.12	1220/1568	4.12	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	9	14	4.42	1305/1572	4.42	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	9	9	7	3.81	1273/1564	3.81	4.31	4.28	4.25	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	5	12	7	3.92	1181/1559	3.92	4.36	4.29	4.23	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	2	1	12	8	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	3	3	3	3.33	1159/1384	3.33	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	1057/1382	3.83	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	0	4	3	3	3.42	1203/1368	3.42	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	10	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	5
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 320 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1394
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	8	7	10	3.93	1254/1649	3.16	4.30	4.28	4.27	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	8	11	4.04	1106/1648	3.13	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	7	11	3.96	983/1375	3.17	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	2	4	8	10	4.08	1021/1595	3.14	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	5	2	10	8	3.84	976/1533	3.21	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	5	4	12	3.85	1062/1512	3.52	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	5	4	10	3.58	1359/1623	2.87	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	7	4.27	1391/1646	4.01	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	2	7	6	4	3.63	1281/1621	3.15	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	4	9	9	3.96	1306/1568	3.29	4.46	4.43	4.39	3.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	1222/1572	4.53	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	8	4	10	3.84	1251/1564	3.27	4.31	4.28	4.25	3.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	4	4	11	3.83	1231/1559	3.15	4.36	4.29	4.23	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	14	0	1	3	0	5	4.00	690/1352	3.28	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	795/1384	3.13	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	905/1382	3.79	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	4	5	5	3.93	1006/1368	4.06	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	370/ 948	4.18	3.93	3.95	4.00	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 320 8620
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME
 Instructor: RICHTER, MARGO
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1395
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	6	2	2	0	3	2.38	1642/1649	3.16	4.30	4.28	4.27	2.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	6	2	2	2	1	2.23	1643/1648	3.13	4.18	4.23	4.18	2.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	1	2	3	1	2.38	1367/1375	3.17	4.18	4.27	4.22	2.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	5	1	2	1	1	2.20	1590/1595	3.14	4.16	4.20	4.21	2.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	2	1	2	2.58	1503/1533	3.21	4.18	4.04	4.05	2.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1395/1512	3.52	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	6	2	2	0	2	2.17	1612/1623	2.87	4.30	4.16	4.08	2.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	9	0	3.75	1621/1646	4.01	4.69	4.69	4.67	3.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	2	2	3	0	2.67	1571/1621	3.15	4.06	4.06	4.02	2.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	4	2	4	1	2	2.62	1550/1568	3.29	4.46	4.43	4.39	2.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	1212/1572	4.53	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	4	4	2	1	2.69	1539/1564	3.27	4.31	4.28	4.25	2.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	1	2	2	2.46	1530/1559	3.15	4.36	4.29	4.23	2.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	2	2	0	2	2.56	1297/1352	3.28	4.17	3.98	3.97	2.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	6	2	1	1	2	2.25	1357/1384	3.13	4.05	4.08	4.11	2.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1224/1382	3.79	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	881/1368	4.06	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 948	4.18	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	57/ 312	4.20	4.18	3.68	3.60	4.20	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	96/ 110	3.50	4.04	3.99	4.05	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 324 0101
 Title INTRO INTERVIEW TECHN
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1396
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	803/1649	4.46	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	873/1648	4.06	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	443/1375	4.43	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	580/1595	4.22	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	3	10	4.18	695/1533	4.36	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	12	4.33	595/1512	3.98	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	915/1623	4.24	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1249/1646	4.38	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	835/1621	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	2	10	4.17	1191/1568	4.28	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	640/1572	4.78	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	728/1564	4.41	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	901/1559	4.46	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	4	5	6	3.88	830/1352	4.29	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	478/1384	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.46	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	383/1382	4.68	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	764/1368	4.36	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.93	3.95	4.00	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 18 Non-major 5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 5	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 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 324 8620
 Title INTRO INTERVIEW TECHN
 Instructor: RUDOW, EDWARD H
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1397
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	18	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	603/1649	4.46	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	18	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	1279/1648	4.06	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	18	0	1	1	1	1	9	4.23	823/1375	4.43	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	18	4	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	1067/1595	4.22	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	342/1533	4.36	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	18	5	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	1191/1512	3.98	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	18	0	0	1	2	2	8	4.31	757/1623	4.24	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	18	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1364/1646	4.38	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	914/1621	4.06	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	1002/1568	4.28	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1071/1572	4.78	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	0	0	4	8	4.38	801/1564	4.41	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	607/1559	4.46	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	2	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	188/1352	4.29	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	437/1384	4.48	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	555/1382	4.68	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	796/1368	4.36	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	19	7	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	****/ 948	4.50	3.93	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	25/ 312	4.63	4.18	3.68	3.60	4.63
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	31	Non-major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 330 0101
 Title CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR
 Instructor: OZDEMIR, METIN
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1398
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	1106/1649	4.12	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	850/1648	4.29	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	908/1375	4.12	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	722/1595	4.33	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	643/1533	4.24	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	210/1623	4.76	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1525/1646	4.06	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1060/1621	3.91	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	755/1568	4.59	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	640/1572	4.88	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	1	12	4.44	741/1564	4.44	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	14	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	157/1352	4.75	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	4	4	3.75	965/1384	3.75	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	533/ 948	3.90	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.90
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.04	3.99	4.05	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	2	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	1	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: WARREN, KIMBERL
 Enrollment: 94
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1399
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	11	21	4.47	683/1649	3.96	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	24	4.61	427/1648	4.05	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	12	21	4.54	513/1375	4.08	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	5	11	16	4.34	709/1595	3.77	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.34	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	2	10	8	12	3.76	1055/1533	3.94	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	9	9	14	4.09	839/1512	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.09	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	28	4.69	284/1623	4.17	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	199/1646	4.88	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	18	8	4.21	731/1621	3.57	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	461/1568	4.35	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	8	25	4.71	1022/1572	4.35	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	14	18	4.47	689/1564	3.75	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	7	25	4.59	607/1559	3.93	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	1	1	6	20	4.48	322/1352	3.89	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.48	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	3	9	14	4.33	613/1384	3.88	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	656/1382	3.90	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	4	8	14	4.30	821/1368	3.90	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	5	5	3	5	4	2.91	881/ 948	3.25	3.93	3.95	4.00	2.91	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 221	3.45	3.79	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 243	3.86	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 212	4.05	4.28	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 209	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 555	4.01	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	4.22	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	1	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.30	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	33	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.13	4.18	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.10	4.04	3.99	4.05	4.00	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: WARREN, KIMBERL
 Enrollment: 94
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1399
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	32				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1400
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	4	5	4	8	7	3.32	1543/1649	3.96	4.30	4.28	4.27	3.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	7	13	4	3.50	1481/1648	4.05	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	9	9	3.64	1156/1375	4.08	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	4	2	6	2	4	3.00	1537/1595	3.77	4.16	4.20	4.21	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	5	12	8	3.89	935/1533	3.94	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	1246/1512	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	8	9	6	3.59	1351/1623	4.17	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	266/1646	4.88	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	3	3	9	7	0	2.91	1535/1621	3.57	4.06	4.06	4.02	2.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	4	11	8	3.85	1369/1568	4.35	4.46	4.43	4.39	3.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	2	2	14	7	3.81	1510/1572	4.35	4.72	4.70	4.64	3.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	3	8	8	5	3.33	1441/1564	3.75	4.31	4.28	4.25	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	4	10	6	3.29	1435/1559	3.93	4.36	4.29	4.23	3.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	2	5	10	4	3.42	1095/1352	3.89	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	5	1	13	3.79	942/1384	3.88	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	4	2	3	4	11	3.67	1146/1382	3.90	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	5	3	6	10	3.88	1043/1368	3.90	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	17	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	555/ 948	3.25	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 221	3.45	3.79	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 243	3.86	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 212	4.05	4.28	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 209	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 555	4.01	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 110	4.10	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C 7	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 28
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 1	Non-major 7
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 23
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1401
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	12	15	7	3.69	1408/1649	3.96	4.30	4.28	4.27	3.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	1	10	13	9	3.67	1408/1648	4.05	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	8	11	10	3.58	1176/1375	4.08	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	3	0	9	13	4	3.52	1394/1595	3.77	4.16	4.20	4.21	3.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	4	14	13	3.86	955/1533	3.94	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	2	5	8	10	3	3.25	1375/1512	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	10	19	4.19	883/1623	4.17	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	13	22	4.63	1081/1646	4.88	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	3	13	9	1	3.14	1478/1621	3.57	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	10	19	4.29	1096/1568	4.35	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	1	11	21	4.36	1346/1572	4.35	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.36
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	2	9	10	9	3.46	1407/1564	3.75	4.31	4.28	4.25	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	8	8	12	3.63	1336/1559	3.93	4.36	4.29	4.23	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	3	4	7	11	3.71	942/1352	3.89	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	9	5	4	3.43	1113/1384	3.88	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	1	8	4	6	3.52	1207/1382	3.90	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.52
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	3	1	5	4	7	3.55	1162/1368	3.90	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	15	10	3	1	3	3	1	2.82	889/ 948	3.25	3.93	3.95	4.00	2.82
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	2	7	10	12	3.94	148/ 221	3.45	3.79	4.16	4.07	3.94
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	1	2	4	9	16	4.16	146/ 243	3.86	4.05	4.12	3.89	4.16
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	2	0	1	3	12	14	4.30	129/ 212	4.05	4.28	4.40	4.21	4.30
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	1	0	0	3	5	23	4.65	78/ 209	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.12	4.65
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	11	0	1	3	8	9	4.19	367/ 555	4.01	4.83	4.29	4.22	4.19
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	67/ 88	4.22	4.45	4.54	4.63	4.22
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	3	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	3	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	4	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	2	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	****/ 288	4.30	3.92	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	3	0	2	1	0	2.17	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 312	4.13	4.18	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	1	3	1	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	****/ 110	4.10	4.04	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1401
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	0	Under-grad	36	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	29				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 8620
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1402
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	2	2	12	19	4.37	816/1649	3.96	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	3	8	22	4.43	672/1648	4.05	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	2	9	23	4.54	513/1375	4.08	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	1	2	16	15	4.23	853/1595	3.77	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	5	8	17	4.25	624/1533	3.94	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	6	11	16	4.24	711/1512	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	3	4	9	17	4.21	861/1623	4.17	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	398/1646	4.88	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	1	1	18	10	4.03	897/1621	3.57	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	10	21	4.50	852/1568	4.35	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	3	7	22	4.52	1231/1572	4.35	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.52	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	4	6	4	15	3.75	1297/1564	3.75	4.31	4.28	4.25	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	2	3	6	20	4.21	994/1559	3.93	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	3	2	4	10	15	3.94	766/1352	3.89	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	6	10	12	3.97	831/1384	3.88	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.97	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	5	3	8	14	3.94	1005/1382	3.90	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	2	5	10	11	3.87	1047/1368	3.90	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	9	4	2	2	7	6	3.43	736/ 948	3.25	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	6	5	6	6	5	2.96	217/ 221	3.45	3.79	4.16	4.07	2.96	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	4	8	8	7	3.57	202/ 243	3.86	4.05	4.12	3.89	3.57	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	2	0	3	6	9	7	3.80	183/ 212	4.05	4.28	4.40	4.21	3.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	2	3	6	6	11	3.75	172/ 209	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.12	3.75	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	3	1	8	5	14	3.84	442/ 555	4.01	4.83	4.29	4.22	3.84	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	****/ 88	4.22	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	32	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	61/ 288	4.30	3.92	3.68	3.58	4.30	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	34	1	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	1	0	0	2	10	4	4.13	64/ 312	4.13	4.18	3.68	3.60	4.13	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	33	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	33	1	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	33	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	26/ 110	4.10	4.04	3.99	4.05	4.20	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 8620
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1402
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
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	25				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1403
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1057/1649	4.14	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	2	3.67	1408/1648	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	3	7	4	3.61	1165/1375	3.78	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	916/1595	4.23	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1065/1533	3.62	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1119/1623	4.05	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	11	5	4.17	1462/1646	4.37	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	0	7	7	0	3.19	1468/1621	3.80	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	5	6	3.94	1319/1568	4.28	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	1165/1572	4.38	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	6	6	2	3.35	1437/1564	4.05	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	1166/1559	4.13	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1177/1352	3.52	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	1132/1384	3.57	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1092/1382	3.89	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	7	2	2	3.23	1257/1368	3.54	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.72	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	4.33	3.79	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.18	3.68	3.60	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	33/ 110	4.14	4.04	3.99	4.05	4.14

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1403
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1404
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1057/1649	4.14	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	2	3.67	1408/1648	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	3	7	4	3.61	1165/1375	3.78	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	916/1595	4.23	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1065/1533	3.62	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1119/1623	4.05	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	11	5	4.17	1462/1646	4.37	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	914/1621	3.80	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1050/1568	4.28	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1449/1572	4.38	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	822/1564	4.05	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1067/1559	4.13	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.12
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	6	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1352	3.52	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	1132/1384	3.57	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1092/1382	3.89	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	7	2	2	3.23	1257/1368	3.54	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.23
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.72	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	4.33	3.79	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.18	3.68	3.60	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	33/ 110	4.14	4.04	3.99	4.05	4.14

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1404
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1405
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1057/1649	4.14	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	2	3.67	1408/1648	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	3	7	4	3.61	1165/1375	3.78	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	916/1595	4.23	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1065/1533	3.62	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1119/1623	4.05	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	11	5	4.17	1462/1646	4.37	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1087/1621	3.80	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1050/1568	4.28	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1409/1572	4.38	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	887/1564	4.05	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	901/1559	4.13	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1130/1352	3.52	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	1132/1384	3.57	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1092/1382	3.89	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	7	2	2	3.23	1257/1368	3.54	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.72	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	4.33	3.79	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.18	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	33/ 110	4.14	4.04	3.99	4.05	4.14	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1405
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1406
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	1057/1649	4.14	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	10	2	3.67	1408/1648	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	3	7	4	3.61	1165/1375	3.78	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	916/1595	4.23	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	5	6	4	3.75	1065/1533	3.62	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	5	7	5	3.89	1035/1512	4.05	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	5	6	6	3.94	1119/1623	4.05	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	11	5	4.17	1462/1646	4.37	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1078/1621	3.80	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1169/1568	4.28	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1419/1572	4.38	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.28	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	1001/1564	4.05	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1075/1559	4.13	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	4	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	1130/1352	3.52	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	2	6	2	3.38	1132/1384	3.57	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	1092/1382	3.89	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	1	7	2	2	3.23	1257/1368	3.54	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	601/ 948	3.72	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	4.33	3.79	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.18	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	33/ 110	4.14	4.04	3.99	4.05	4.14	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1406
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	5	12	13	4.27	954/1649	4.14	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	14	12	4.23	920/1648	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	12	15	4.37	704/1375	3.78	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	20	4.53	462/1595	4.23	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	7	3	4	7	6	3.07	1428/1533	3.62	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	12	16	4.47	436/1512	4.05	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	7	9	13	4.13	947/1623	4.05	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	21	4.70	1004/1646	4.37	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	2	11	12	4.31	632/1621	3.80	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	8	18	4.45	930/1568	4.28	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	0	7	20	4.55	1193/1572	4.38	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	14	10	4.07	1100/1564	4.05	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	5	5	17	4.21	1002/1559	4.13	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	8	10	9	3.90	824/1352	3.52	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	4	5	5	13	4.00	795/1384	3.57	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	5	5	16	4.33	774/1382	3.89	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	2	9	14	4.30	821/1368	3.54	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	2	8	6	4	3.48	713/ 948	3.72	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.48	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	4.33	3.79	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	4.00	4.18	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	****/ 110	4.14	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	12	C 4	Under-grad 31
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D 0	Non-major 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	
				Other 28	
				? 1	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: STO DOMINGO, MA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1408
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	6	8	8	3.92	1263/1649	4.14	4.30	4.28	4.27	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	6	10	4.04	1100/1648	3.82	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	4	7	9	3.88	1049/1375	3.78	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	7	12	4.13	983/1595	4.23	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	6	8	3.67	1139/1533	3.62	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	8	11	4.26	675/1512	4.05	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.26	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	15	4.38	671/1623	4.05	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	0	0	22	4.87	731/1646	4.37	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	3	6	4	6	3.55	1323/1621	3.80	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	3	16	4.42	969/1568	4.28	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	1121/1572	4.38	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	2	8	10	4.00	1127/1564	4.05	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	3	14	4.08	1084/1559	4.13	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	2	1	5	2	10	3.85	848/1352	3.52	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	2	4	11	3.91	886/1384	3.57	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	4	5	10	3.95	988/1382	3.89	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	6	3	11	4.05	936/1368	3.54	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	573/ 948	3.72	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.82	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	99/ 221	4.33	3.79	4.16	4.07	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.30	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 312	4.00	4.18	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	4.14	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: STO DOMINGO, MA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1408
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	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	18				
				?	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	1	0	1	0	9	21	16	4.09	1129/1649	4.01	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	13	18	14	3.91	1218/1648	3.96	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	8	17	18	4.02	943/1375	4.04	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	5	10	14	13	3.77	1280/1595	3.80	4.16	4.20	4.21	3.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	2	5	9	8	19	3.86	955/1533	4.05	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	8	14	13	6	3.25	1375/1512	3.60	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	10	30	4.47	555/1623	4.29	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	18	28	4.61	1103/1646	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.61	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	21	16	1	3.44	1387/1621	3.54	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	10	32	4.61	731/1568	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	6	14	25	4.37	1346/1572	4.52	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	9	18	17	4.09	1091/1564	4.01	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	11	15	17	3.96	1159/1559	3.98	4.36	4.29	4.23	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	5	19	20	4.22	541/1352	4.28	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	3	6	4	1	2.94	1286/1384	3.26	4.05	4.08	4.11	2.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	3	4	4	5	3.69	1137/1382	3.34	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	905/1368	3.68	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	32	14	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	44	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	9	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 2	Graduate	0	Major	31	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 22						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C 8	General	5	Under-grad	48	Non-major	17
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	5	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 0						
				I 0	Other	34				
				? 0						

Course-Section: PSYC 335 8620
 Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: LYNCH, MINDA
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1410
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	13	0	2	0	4	2	9	3.94	1236/1649	4.01	4.30	4.28	4.27	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	2	0	3	3	9	4.00	1124/1648	3.96	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	0	6	4	7	4.06	932/1375	4.04	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	2	3	8	4	3.82	1248/1595	3.80	4.16	4.20	4.21	3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	643/1533	4.05	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	966/1512	3.60	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	2	2	5	8	4.12	968/1623	4.29	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	13	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	697/1646	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	1	0	8	1	3.64	1281/1621	3.54	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	1050/1568	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	1071/1572	4.52	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1191/1564	4.01	4.31	4.28	4.25	3.93
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1121/1559	3.98	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	457/1352	4.28	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	2	3	4	6	3.59	1047/1384	3.26	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	4	2	5	2	4	3.00	1316/1382	3.34	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	3	2	5	4	3.24	1257/1368	3.68	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.24
4. Were special techniques successful	13	12	2	2	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.00	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 4	General 4	Under-grad 30	Non-major 28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 340 0101
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1411
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	2	4	11	14	11	3.67	1429/1649	4.11	4.30	4.28	4.27	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	4	7	11	11	9	3.33	1546/1648	3.87	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	5	11	13	11	3.62	1165/1375	4.02	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	36	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	****/1595	4.55	4.16	4.20	4.21	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	10	18	9	3.71	1103/1533	4.33	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	39	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/1512	****	4.05	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	1	11	27	4.48	541/1623	4.56	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	3	30	9	4.14	1476/1646	4.55	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	7	17	12	3	3.17	1470/1621	3.84	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	5	8	11	13	3.72	1414/1568	4.16	4.46	4.43	4.39	3.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	3	34	4.82	790/1572	4.84	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	5	10	9	10	5	3.00	1496/1564	3.80	4.31	4.28	4.25	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	4	9	9	13	3.59	1349/1559	4.04	4.36	4.29	4.23	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	2	3	7	15	9	3.72	935/1352	3.73	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	14	4	1	6	1	2.08	1364/1384	3.36	4.05	4.08	4.11	2.08	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	6	4	8	5	3	2.81	1349/1382	3.73	4.28	4.29	4.37	2.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	6	6	8	3	3	2.65	1340/1368	3.77	4.34	4.30	4.39	2.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	22	3	0	0	0	1	2.00	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	7	Under-grad	44	Non-major	22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 340 8620
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: RUDOW, EDWARD H
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1412
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	12	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	577/1649	4.11	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	702/1648	3.87	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	13	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	641/1375	4.02	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	8	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	451/1595	4.55	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	64/1533	4.33	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	14	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	****/1512	****	4.05	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	12	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	333/1623	4.56	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	398/1646	4.55	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	374/1621	3.84	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	731/1568	4.16	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	715/1572	4.84	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	550/1564	3.80	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	695/1559	4.04	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	5	1	4	0	3	7	3.73	928/1352	3.73	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	343/1384	3.36	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	502/1382	3.73	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	285/1368	3.77	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	12	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	8	3	4.27	47/ 312	4.27	4.18	3.68	3.60	4.27	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	32	Non-major	20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 342 0101
 Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1413
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	9	36	4.69	408/1649	4.69	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	15	29	4.52	533/1648	4.52	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	10	34	4.60	464/1375	4.60	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	5	12	28	4.38	660/1595	4.38	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	11	32	4.46	421/1533	4.46	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	6	5	13	23	4.13	817/1512	4.13	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	9	12	25	4.25	815/1623	4.25	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	12	35	4.74	929/1646	4.74	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	22	24	4.49	401/1621	4.49	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	5	41	4.79	405/1568	4.79	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	45	4.96	296/1572	4.96	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	40	4.81	253/1564	4.81	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	41	4.81	306/1559	4.81	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	3	11	30	4.56	275/1352	4.56	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	376/1384	4.60	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	211/1368	4.92	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	16	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 31	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 33
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 6	C 2	General 15	Under-grad 49 Non-major 16
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 345 8620
 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH
 Instructor: RICHTER, JOHN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1414
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	3	0	8	12	4.26	954/1649	4.26	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	1	1	5	8	8	3.91	1218/1648	3.91	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.91
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	2	2	1	9	9	3.91	1025/1375	3.91	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	1	0	2	3	7	10	4.14	970/1595	4.14	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	2	2	1	13	3.90	915/1533	3.90	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	3	3	5	10	3.91	1022/1512	3.91	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	1	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	780/1623	4.29	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	332/1646	4.95	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	1	1	9	6	4.18	777/1621	4.18	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	372/1568	4.82	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	1	0	0	0	22	4.83	790/1572	4.83	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	610/1564	4.55	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	1	18	4.52	673/1559	4.52	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	4	2	1	2	8	5	3.72	935/1352	3.72	4.17	3.98	3.97	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	2	4	8	6	3.52	1072/1384	3.52	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	1	5	5	10	3.87	1046/1382	3.87	4.28	4.29	4.37	3.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	2	3	6	11	4.04	936/1368	4.04	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.04
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	3	3	3	4	3.62	672/ 948	3.62	3.93	3.95	4.00	3.62
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	260/ 555	4.72	4.83	4.29	4.22	4.72
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	1	0	1	0	6	0	3.71	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	1	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: PSYC 345 8620
 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH
 Instructor: RICHTER, JOHN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1414
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	6	Under-grad	33	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 357 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 52

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1415
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	2	0	11	16	13	3.90	1272/1649	3.90	4.30	4.28	4.27	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	2	14	15	11	3.83	1287/1648	3.83	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	4	3	14	7	14	3.57	1180/1375	3.57	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	1	2	5	11	13	10	3.59	1377/1595	3.59	4.16	4.20	4.21	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	1	0	1	12	10	16	4.05	781/1533	4.05	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	10	3	2	11	6	8	3.47	1287/1512	3.47	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	2	3	10	8	18	3.90	1180/1623	3.90	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	1	0	0	0	0	40	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	1	2	2	10	13	2	3.38	1415/1621	3.38	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	3	9	27	4.62	715/1568	4.62	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	1	0	3	3	33	4.68	1059/1572	4.68	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	3	10	25	4.58	580/1564	4.58	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	1	6	10	20	4.15	1038/1559	4.15	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	2	2	9	7	19	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	3	3	6	14	4.19	708/1384	4.19	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	0	1	2	7	16	4.46	656/1382	4.46	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	1	10	15	4.54	631/1368	4.54	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	9	0	1	5	4	7	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.93	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	50	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	49	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	50	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 30
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 9	General 17	Under-grad 52	Non-major 22
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 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	2	2	6	14	14	3.95	1236/1649	3.95	4.30	4.28	4.27	3.95	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	1	11	11	11	3.63	1428/1648	3.63	4.18	4.23	4.18	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	9	8	15	3.76	1107/1375	3.76	4.18	4.27	4.22	3.76	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	31	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	****/1595	****	4.16	4.20	4.21	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	6	5	5	12	7	3.26	1366/1533	3.26	4.18	4.04	4.05	3.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	33	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/1512	****	4.05	4.10	4.11	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	4	10	20	4.31	757/1623	4.31	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	2	18	6	10	3.67	1626/1646	3.67	4.69	4.69	4.67	3.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	2	1	10	14	3	3.50	1345/1621	3.50	4.06	4.06	4.02	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	2	32	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	7	25	4.58	1165/1572	4.58	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	8	11	11	3.82	1262/1564	3.82	4.31	4.28	4.25	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	4	7	21	4.17	1031/1559	4.17	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	0	2	4	10	11	4.11	624/1352	4.11	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	7	1	2	4	7	3.14	1232/1384	3.14	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	5	4	5	1	6	2.95	1330/1382	2.95	4.28	4.29	4.37	2.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	3	5	4	4	5	3.14	1276/1368	3.14	4.34	4.30	4.39	3.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	3	0	1	0	10	0	3.82	85/ 110	3.82	4.04	3.99	4.05	3.82	

Course-Section: PSYC 360 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 101
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1416
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C	11	General	4	Under-grad	38	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0101
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1417
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	8	0	0	2	4	10	21	4.35	844/1649	4.35	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	2	9	26	4.58	475/1648	4.58	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	0	2	8	27	4.58	488/1375	4.58	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	5	2	1	6	8	15	4.03	1049/1595	4.03	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	1	6	13	15	4.20	680/1533	4.20	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	5	10	10	8	3.49	1276/1512	3.49	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.49	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	0	6	5	25	4.53	480/1623	4.53	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	12	24	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	1	0	0	5	9	14	4.32	607/1621	4.32	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	7	29	4.81	387/1568	4.81	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	355/1572	4.94	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	2	4	30	4.78	310/1564	4.78	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	2	32	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	1	0	2	4	10	18	4.29	488/1352	4.29	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	1	3	4	6	3.69	1002/1384	3.69	4.05	4.08	4.11	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	932/1382	4.06	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	844/1368	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	8	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.07	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	42	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.30	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.46	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	42	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	44	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0101
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 79
 Questionnaires: 45

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1417
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	45	Non-major	28
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 382 0101
 Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1418
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	5	31	4.72	372/1649	4.72	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	30	4.77	253/1648	4.77	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	27	4.59	480/1375	4.59	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	14	21	4.44	594/1595	4.44	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	13	20	4.37	515/1533	4.37	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	5	14	18	4.35	574/1512	4.35	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	10	26	4.68	308/1623	4.68	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	14	20	4.54	339/1621	4.54	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	37	4.95	147/1568	4.95	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	178/1572	4.97	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	30	4.74	358/1564	4.74	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	164/1559	4.92	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	6	31	4.74	162/1352	4.74	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	201/1384	4.81	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	369/1368	4.81	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	12	1	1	2	3	2	3.44	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	14	Under-grad	39	Non-major	9
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 385 0101
 Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 58
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1419
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	5	33	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	8	29	4.69	323/1648	4.69	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	6	32	4.84	206/1375	4.84	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	3	1	0	4	11	21	4.38	672/1595	4.38	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	2	5	12	18	4.08	768/1533	4.08	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	5	15	17	4.24	711/1512	4.24	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	3	8	10	16	3.97	1074/1623	3.97	4.30	4.16	4.08	3.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	12	27	4.69	1004/1646	4.69	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	11	30	4.73	178/1621	4.73	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	10	27	4.68	604/1568	4.68	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	178/1572	4.97	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	8	29	4.74	374/1564	4.74	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	33	4.87	250/1559	4.87	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	7	1	3	5	4	16	4.07	655/1352	4.07	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	3	2	14	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	2	1	16	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	15	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C	0
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	8	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	2
				Required for Majors	4
				General	7
				Electives	1
				Other	17
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: PSYC 387 0101
 Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1420
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	14	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	395/1649	4.70	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	14	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	323/1648	4.70	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	219/1375	4.83	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	14	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	428/1595	4.57	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	162/1533	4.78	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	271/1512	4.65	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	14	0	0	0	1	6	16	4.65	333/1623	4.65	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	14	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	799/1646	4.83	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	3	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	322/1621	4.56	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	245/1568	4.91	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	296/1572	4.95	4.72	4.70	4.64	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	310/1564	4.77	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	361/1559	4.77	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	252/1352	4.59	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	275/1384	4.72	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.72
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	158/1368	4.94	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	19	0	0	1	2	5	10	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	3.93	3.95	4.00	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: PSYC 387 0101
 Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1420
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	37	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 393 0101
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN PSYC
 Instructor: ROHRBACH, ALISO
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1421
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.30	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.16	4.20	4.21	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.18	4.04	4.05	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1170/1512	3.67	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.30	4.16	4.08	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	234/1621	4.67	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.46	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.17	3.98	3.97	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 393G 8620
 Title: GROUP DYNAMICS
 Instructor: ROSEN, TED
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1422
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.18	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	806/1375	4.25	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.16	4.20	4.21	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	515/1533	4.36	4.18	4.04	4.05	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	755/1512	4.20	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	1	0	1	2	1	6	4.20	883/1623	4.20	4.30	4.16	4.08	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1070/1646	4.64	4.69	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.46	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	607/1559	4.58	4.36	4.29	4.23	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	157/1352	4.75	4.17	3.98	3.97	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	489/1384	4.45	4.05	4.08	4.11	4.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	585/1382	4.55	4.28	4.29	4.37	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	358/1368	4.82	4.34	4.30	4.39	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	281/ 948	4.40	3.93	3.95	4.00	4.40	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.22	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	47/ 88	4.64	4.45	4.54	4.63	4.64	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	1	0	0	0	10	4.64	41/ 85	4.64	4.40	4.47	4.55	4.64	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	48/ 81	4.36	4.20	4.43	4.30	4.36	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	48/ 92	4.45	4.35	4.35	4.46	4.45	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	153/ 288	3.92	3.92	3.68	3.58	3.92	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.18	3.68	3.60	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 406 0101
 Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1423
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	306/1649	4.78	4.30	4.28	4.50	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	291/1648	4.72	4.18	4.23	4.36	4.72	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.18	4.27	4.48	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	4	1	9	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.16	4.20	4.36	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	11	4.17	703/1533	4.17	4.18	4.04	4.14	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	6	7	4.06	854/1512	4.06	4.05	4.10	4.26	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	2	14	4.65	345/1623	4.65	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	6	4.35	1325/1646	4.35	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	178/1621	4.73	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	147/1568	4.94	4.46	4.43	4.54	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	101/1564	4.94	4.31	4.28	4.40	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	291/1352	4.53	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	302/1384	4.70	4.05	4.08	4.35	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382	4.90	4.28	4.29	4.56	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	493/1368	4.70	4.34	4.30	4.58	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 948	****	3.93	3.95	4.31	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.22	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 407 8620
 Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1424
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	230/1649	4.85	4.30	4.28	4.50	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	216/1648	4.80	4.18	4.23	4.36	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.18	4.27	4.48	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	144/1595	4.89	4.16	4.20	4.36	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	18	4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.18	4.04	4.14	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	66/1512	4.95	4.05	4.10	4.26	4.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	145/1623	4.85	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	664/1646	4.90	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	207/1621	4.69	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	424/1568	4.79	4.46	4.43	4.54	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	187/1564	4.89	4.31	4.28	4.40	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	227/1559	4.89	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	247/1352	4.60	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.05	4.08	4.35	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	170/1382	4.94	4.28	4.29	4.56	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	1	0	1	2	7	4.27	334/ 948	4.27	3.93	3.95	4.31	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.57	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	4.33	4.35	4.63	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	66/ 288	4.25	3.92	3.68	3.71	4.25	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.95	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.64	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.85	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	14/ 110	4.57	4.04	3.99	4.22	4.57	

Course-Section: PSYC 407 8620
 Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1424
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	21	Non-major	7
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 409 0101
 Title DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCAT
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1425
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	1136/1649	4.07	4.30	4.28	4.50	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	4	3.93	1208/1648	3.93	4.18	4.23	4.36	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	840/1375	4.21	4.18	4.27	4.48	4.21		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	7	3	3.86	1231/1595	3.86	4.16	4.20	4.36	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	768/1533	4.07	4.18	4.04	4.14	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	7	2	3.64	1180/1512	3.64	4.05	4.10	4.26	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	5	7	4.21	861/1623	4.21	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.93	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	6	5	0	3.25	1451/1621	3.25	4.06	4.06	4.24	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	1205/1568	4.14	4.46	4.43	4.54	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	1305/1572	4.43	4.72	4.70	4.79	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1316/1564	3.71	4.31	4.28	4.40	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	5	4	3.79	1258/1559	3.79	4.36	4.29	4.41	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	0	7	2	1	2.85	1265/1352	2.85	4.17	3.98	4.07	2.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	3	0	3	3	3.67	1011/1384	3.67	4.05	4.08	4.35	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	2	3	0	3	3.22	1284/1382	3.22	4.28	4.29	4.56	3.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	2	3	0	1	2.33	1351/1368	2.33	4.34	4.30	4.58	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	736/ 948	3.43	3.93	3.95	4.31	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3
84-150	9	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
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 463 0101
 Title EATING: NORMAL/ABNORMA
 Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1426
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.30	4.28	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	475/1648	4.57	4.18	4.23	4.36	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.18	4.27	4.48	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	106/1595	4.92	4.16	4.20	4.36	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	454/1533	4.43	4.18	4.04	4.14	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	133/1512	4.86	4.05	4.10	4.26	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	0	0	3	10	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	977/1646	4.71	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1114/1621	3.85	4.06	4.06	4.24	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.93	4.46	4.43	4.54	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	876/1572	4.79	4.72	4.70	4.79	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	498/1564	4.64	4.31	4.28	4.40	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	590/1352	4.15	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.15	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1384	4.78	4.05	4.08	4.35	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.34	4.30	4.58	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	578/ 948	3.80	3.93	3.95	4.31	3.80	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101
 Title SOCIAL/HEALTH
 Instructor: BEDI AKO, SHAWN
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1427
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	577/1649	4.55	4.30	4.28	4.50	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.18	4.23	4.36	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.18	4.27	4.48	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	697/1595	4.35	4.16	4.20	4.36	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	249/1533	4.65	4.18	4.04	4.14	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.05	4.10	4.26	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	220/1623	4.75	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	11	7	4.32	1356/1646	4.32	4.69	4.69	4.71	4.32	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	216/1621	4.69	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	604/1568	4.68	4.46	4.43	4.54	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	615/1572	4.89	4.72	4.70	4.79	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	689/1564	4.47	4.31	4.28	4.40	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	347/1559	4.79	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	616/1352	4.13	4.17	3.98	4.07	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	190/1384	4.82	4.05	4.08	4.35	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	0	15	4.76	383/1382	4.76	4.28	4.29	4.56	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	158/1368	4.94	4.34	4.30	4.58	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	5	2	8	4.06	417/ 948	4.06	3.93	3.95	4.31	4.06	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.61	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	8
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	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	15				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 493B 0101
 Title CHILDREN W/ DISABILITI
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1428
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	93/1649	4.96	4.30	4.28	4.50	4.96	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	74/1648	4.96	4.18	4.23	4.36	4.96	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	83/1375	4.96	4.18	4.27	4.48	4.96	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.16	4.20	4.36	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	0	3	16	4.52	350/1533	4.52	4.18	4.04	4.14	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	128/1512	4.86	4.05	4.10	4.26	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	109/1623	4.91	4.30	4.16	4.27	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.71	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	97/1621	4.89	4.06	4.06	4.24	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.46	4.43	4.54	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	85/1564	4.95	4.31	4.28	4.40	4.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.17	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.05	4.08	4.35	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.56	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	143/ 948	4.70	3.93	3.95	4.31	4.70	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.66	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.44	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.71	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	4
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	2	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	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601B 0101
 Title TOPICS IN COMM. SOC.PS
 Instructor: MATON, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1429
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.18	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.05	4.10	4.35	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.41	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.05	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.92	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601D 0101
 Title CORE I
 Instructor: BAKER, LINDA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1430
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1498/1649	3.50	4.30	4.28	4.46	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1546/1648	3.33	4.18	4.23	4.34	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1150/1375	3.67	4.18	4.27	4.44	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1470/1595	3.33	4.16	4.20	4.35	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	986/1533	3.83	4.18	4.04	4.28	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	3.50	1266/1512	3.50	4.05	4.10	4.35	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.30	4.16	4.29	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1151/1621	3.80	4.06	4.06	4.20	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1440/1568	3.60	4.46	4.43	4.52	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1321/1572	4.40	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1273/1564	3.80	4.31	4.28	4.41	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1448/1559	3.20	4.36	4.29	4.41	3.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	879/1352	3.80	4.17	3.98	4.10	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	1011/1384	3.67	4.05	4.08	4.30	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	70/ 88	4.17	4.45	4.54	4.63	4.17	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	62/ 85	4.25	4.40	4.47	4.50	4.25	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	77/ 81	3.50	4.20	4.43	4.43	3.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	66/ 92	4.00	4.35	4.35	4.42	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	208/ 288	3.33	3.92	3.68	3.87	3.33	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.92	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 4	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 2	Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	4	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: PSYC 601E 0101
 Title MENTAL&DEVELP DISABILI
 Instructor: BORRERO, JOHN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1431
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	577/1649	4.56	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	643/1648	4.44	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	714/1375	4.36	4.18	4.27	4.44	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	3	13	4.44	580/1595	4.44	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	302/1512	4.61	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	581/1623	4.44	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	398/1646	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	129/1621	4.82	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	14	4.71	422/1564	4.71	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	434/1559	4.72	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	208/1352	4.67	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	359/1384	4.63	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	464/1382	4.69	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	358/1368	4.81	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	310/ 948	4.33	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.87	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 12	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 7	Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	13	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 601F 0101
 Title Core I
 Instructor: Waldstein, Shari
 Enrollment: 0
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 20
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1498/1649	****	4.52	4.28	4.11	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1287/1648	****	4.35	4.23	4.16	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	1351/1375	****	4.38	4.27	4.10	2.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1537/1595	****	4.38	4.20	4.03	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	986/1533	****	4.01	4.04	3.87	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1266/1512	****	4.35	4.10	3.86	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1387/1623	****	4.22	4.16	4.08	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	****	4.85	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1504/1621	****	4.07	4.06	3.96	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	3.33	1488/1568	****	4.50	4.43	4.39	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1365/1572	****	4.82	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1388/1564	****	4.29	4.28	4.20	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1524/1559	****	4.34	4.29	4.20	2.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1049/1352	****	3.91	3.98	3.86	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1384	****	4.39	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	483/1382	****	4.49	4.29	4.03	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	796/1368	****	4.43	4.30	4.01	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	****	4.24	3.95	3.75	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.75	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.38	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.67	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.13	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.36	3.68	3.54	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	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: PSYC 601H 8620
 Title INTRO TO INDUS/ORG PSY
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1432
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	749/1649	4.43	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	6	4.29	862/1648	4.29	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1375	****	4.18	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	865/1595	4.21	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	895/1533	3.93	4.18	4.04	4.28	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	261/1623	4.71	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1078/1621	3.89	4.06	4.06	4.20	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	715/1568	4.62	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.85	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	754/1564	4.43	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	881/1559	4.36	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	3	7	4.07	650/1352	4.07	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	876/1384	3.92	4.05	4.08	4.30	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	1	3	1	3	3.44	727/ 948	3.44	3.93	3.95	4.03	3.44	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	57/ 312	4.20	4.18	3.68	3.83	4.20	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	12	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	3	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601J 8620
 Title HUMAN FACTORS
 Instructor: DEVRIES, ESTHER
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1433
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	296/1375	4.75	4.18	4.27	4.44	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	150/1595	4.88	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	733/1533	4.13	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	553/1512	4.38	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	135/1623	4.88	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	714/1646	4.88	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	287/1568	4.88	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	234/1352	4.63	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1382	4.63	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.73	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	31/ 288	4.67	3.92	3.68	3.87	4.67	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601K 8620
 Title LEG, ETH & PROF ISS I/
 Instructor: LASSON, ELLIOTT
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1434
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	3	7	4.15	1067/1649	4.15	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	5	3.77	1340/1648	3.77	4.18	4.23	4.34	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	4	1	3.15	1308/1375	3.15	4.18	4.27	4.44	3.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	469/1623	4.54	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1478/1621	3.14	4.06	4.06	4.20	3.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	8	3	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1453/1572	4.08	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.08	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1324/1564	3.69	4.31	4.28	4.41	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1181/1559	3.92	4.36	4.29	4.41	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	633/1352	4.10	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	673/1384	4.25	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	925/1368	4.08	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	826/ 948	3.14	3.93	3.95	4.03	3.14	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	282/ 555	4.60	4.83	4.29	4.66	4.60	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	66/ 288	4.25	3.92	3.68	3.87	4.25	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601L 8620
 Title INTRO DATA ANALY PROC
 Instructor: GRIFFITH, JIM
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1435
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1327/1649	3.83	4.30	4.28	4.46	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1287/1648	3.83	4.18	4.23	4.34	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1071/1375	3.83	4.18	4.27	4.44	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	4.16	4.20	4.35	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1139/1533	3.67	4.18	4.04	4.28	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	1	2	1	3.17	1506/1623	3.17	4.30	4.16	4.29	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	1037/1646	4.67	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1321/1572	4.40	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1360/1564	3.60	4.31	4.28	4.41	3.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1246/1559	3.80	4.36	4.29	4.41	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	4.17	3.98	4.10	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	937/1384	3.80	4.05	4.08	4.30	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	869/1382	4.20	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.87	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	57/ 312	4.20	4.18	3.68	3.83	4.20	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.92	****	

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	3	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	6
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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601M 8620
 Title: GROUP DECISION MAKING
 Instructor: ROSEN, TED
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1436
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	1229/1648	3.90	4.18	4.23	4.34	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1162/1375	3.63	4.18	4.27	4.44	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	759/1595	4.30	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	680/1533	4.20	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	835/1512	4.10	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.30	4.16	4.29	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	664/1646	4.90	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	971/1564	4.22	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	360/1352	4.44	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	262/1382	4.89	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	399/ 948	4.13	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.13	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	67/ 88	4.22	4.45	4.54	4.63	4.22	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	38/ 85	4.67	4.40	4.47	4.50	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	63/ 81	4.00	4.20	4.43	4.43	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	65/ 92	4.11	4.35	4.35	4.42	4.11	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	228/ 288	3.10	3.92	3.68	3.87	3.10	

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	9	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 605 0101
 Title LEARNING AND COGNITION
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1437
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	954/1649	4.27	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.27	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	614/1648	4.47	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	4	4.00	950/1375	4.00	4.18	4.27	4.44	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1387/1512	3.22	4.05	4.10	4.35	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	85/1623	4.93	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	766/1621	4.18	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	731/1568	4.60	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	1273/1572	4.47	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	780/1564	4.40	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	749/1559	4.47	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	556/1352	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	418/1384	4.53	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	185/1368	4.93	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	234/ 948	4.47	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.47	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.61	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	13	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 611 0101
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROC I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1438
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	256/1649	4.82	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	310/1648	4.71	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	823/1375	4.24	4.18	4.27	4.44	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	538/1595	4.47	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	350/1533	4.53	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	574/1512	4.35	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	130/1623	4.88	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	398/1646	4.94	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	766/1621	4.19	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	1	5	8	4.06	1257/1568	4.06	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	1096/1572	4.65	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	6	5	3.76	1292/1564	3.76	4.31	4.28	4.41	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	4	10	4.18	1023/1559	4.18	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	1	4	1	3	3.67	970/1352	3.67	4.17	3.98	4.10	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	6	1	5	3.25	1192/1384	3.25	4.05	4.08	4.30	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	0	4	0	9	3.75	1098/1382	3.75	4.28	4.29	4.52	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	1047/1368	3.87	4.34	4.30	4.56	3.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	1	3	4	4	3.69	629/ 948	3.69	3.93	3.95	4.03	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	154/ 221	3.92	3.79	4.16	4.27	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	91/ 243	4.42	4.05	4.12	4.61	4.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	74/ 212	4.73	4.28	4.40	4.73	4.73	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	93/ 209	4.58	4.33	4.35	4.80	4.58	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	5	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	349/ 555	4.29	4.83	4.29	4.66	4.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
Grad.	10	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: PSYC 615 0101
 Title METH APPL BEHAV AN
 Instructor: DELEON, ISER
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1439
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	965/1649	4.25	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	401/1648	4.64	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	212/1375	4.83	4.18	4.27	4.44	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	844/1512	4.08	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	321/1623	4.67	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572	4.92	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	570/1564	4.58	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	389/1352	4.42	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	203/ 948	4.50	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	33/ 88	4.82	4.45	4.54	4.63	4.82	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	60/ 85	4.27	4.40	4.47	4.50	4.27	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	60/ 81	4.10	4.20	4.43	4.43	4.10	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	48/ 92	4.45	4.35	4.35	4.42	4.45	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	80/ 288	4.09	3.92	3.68	3.87	4.09	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.51	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	4.17	4.09	4.47	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.50	4.47	4.58	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.80	4.38	4.44	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.18	3.68	3.83	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 620 0101
 Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1440
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	471/1649	4.64	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1070/1648	4.09	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.18	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	754/1533	4.09	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	0	5	3.82	1234/1623	3.82	4.30	4.16	4.29	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	816/1646	4.82	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	129/1621	4.82	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568	4.82	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	511/1564	4.64	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	434/1559	4.73	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	556/1352	4.20	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	275/1384	4.73	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	243/1382	4.91	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	461/1368	4.73	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	323/ 948	4.30	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.30	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	5.00	4.83	4.29	4.66	5.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	83/ 288	4.00	3.92	3.68	3.87	4.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.18	3.68	3.83	4.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.92	4.00	

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 9		Graduate 11
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 622 0101
 Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN I
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1441
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies						Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.30	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	977/1648	4.18	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	788/1375	4.27	4.18	4.27	4.44	4.27	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	818/1595	4.25	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	515/1533	4.36	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	664/1646	4.91	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	94/1621	4.90	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	372/1568	4.82	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	169/1564	4.91	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	306/1559	4.82	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	129/1352	4.82	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	275/1384	4.73	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	332/1382	4.82	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	550/1368	4.64	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	370/ 948	4.18	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.18
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.92	****

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	11	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 623 0101
 Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN II
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1442
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1351/1649	3.80	4.30	4.28	4.46	3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1313/1648	3.80	4.18	4.23	4.34	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	855/1375	4.20	4.18	4.27	4.44	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1180/1533	3.60	4.18	4.04	4.28	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	755/1512	4.20	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1151/1621	3.80	4.06	4.06	4.20	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	1321/1572	4.40	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1273/1564	3.80	4.31	4.28	4.41	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1009/1559	4.20	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	****	4.17	3.98	4.10	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	752/1368	4.40	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 3
Grad.	2	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: PSYC 636 0101
 Title PRIMARY PREVENTION
 Instructor: MATON, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1443
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1272/1649	3.91	4.30	4.28	4.46	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	1	3.27	1559/1648	3.27	4.18	4.23	4.34	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	3	1	3.09	1528/1595	3.09	4.16	4.20	4.35	3.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	421/1533	4.45	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1334/1512	3.36	4.05	4.10	4.35	3.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	5	1	1	2.82	1569/1623	2.82	4.30	4.16	4.29	2.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1375/1621	3.45	4.06	4.06	4.20	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1411/1568	3.73	4.46	4.43	4.52	3.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	815/1572	4.82	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	1010/1564	4.18	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	4	3.91	1197/1559	3.91	4.36	4.29	4.41	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	3	3.91	886/1384	3.91	4.05	4.08	4.30	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	875/1382	4.18	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	703/1368	4.45	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	3.93	3.95	4.03	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	65/ 88	4.25	4.45	4.54	4.63	4.25	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	56/ 85	4.38	4.40	4.47	4.50	4.38	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	47/ 81	4.38	4.20	4.43	4.43	4.38	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	62/ 92	4.25	4.35	4.35	4.42	4.25	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	2	5	0	0	2.50	253/ 288	2.50	3.92	3.68	3.87	2.50	

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	6	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	5	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	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: PSYC 655 0101
 Title ADV TOP A BEHAV AN
 Instructor: KAHNG, SUNG W
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1444
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	408/1649	4.69	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	336/1648	4.69	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	443/1375	4.63	4.18	4.27	4.44	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	10	4.31	746/1595	4.31	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	146/1533	4.81	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	263/1512	4.67	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	135/1623	4.88	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1166/1646	4.53	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	904/1568	4.47	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	374/1564	4.73	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	13	4.73	419/1559	4.73	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	0	1	0	5	3.75	914/1352	3.75	4.17	3.98	4.10	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.05	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	302/1382	4.85	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	211/1368	4.92	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	170/ 948	4.60	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.60	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.04	3.99	3.92	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 695A 0101
 Title SEM:FAMILY THERAPY
 Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1445
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.30	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.18	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.18	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.16	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.18	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.05	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	635/1623	4.40	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1621	4.80	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	263/1564	4.80	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	133/1352	4.80	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.05	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	3.93	3.95	4.03	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 695B 0101
 Title SEM:QUAL. MTDS. IN PSY
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1446
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	484/1649	4.63	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	782/1595	4.29	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	272/1533	4.63	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	294/1512	4.63	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	780/1564	4.40	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	318/1559	4.80	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1352	****	4.17	3.98	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.05	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.28	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	170/ 948	4.60	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.60	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	45/ 88	4.67	4.45	4.54	4.63	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	27/ 85	4.83	4.40	4.47	4.50	4.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	25/ 81	4.83	4.20	4.43	4.43	4.83	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	25/ 92	4.80	4.35	4.35	4.42	4.80	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	165/ 288	3.83	3.92	3.68	3.87	3.83	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	5.00	4.06	4.51	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	23/ 48	4.17	4.17	4.09	4.47	4.17	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	21/ 39	4.50	4.50	4.47	4.58	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	36/ 39	3.80	3.80	4.38	4.44	3.80	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	21/ 312	4.67	4.18	3.68	3.83	4.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	26/ 110	4.20	4.04	3.99	3.92	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 715 0101
 Title MEASUREMENT OF BEHAVIO
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1447
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	186/1649	4.90	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	263/1648	4.75	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	258/1375	4.79	4.18	4.27	4.44	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	218/1595	4.78	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	7	7	4.05	781/1533	4.05	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	146/1512	4.82	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	169/1623	4.80	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	185/1621	4.72	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	245/1568	4.90	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	600/1564	4.55	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.05	4.08	4.30	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	493/1368	4.70	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	330/ 948	4.29	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	3.79	4.16	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.05	4.12	4.61	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.73	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.83	4.29	4.66	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 110	****	4.04	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	12
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: PSYC 730 0101
 Title PARENTING
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1448
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.30	4.28	4.46	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	441/1648	4.60	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1375	****	4.18	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	3.70	1149/1512	3.70	4.05	4.10	4.35	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	757/1623	4.30	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1506/1646	4.10	4.69	4.69	4.81	4.10	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	7	2	4.10	859/1621	4.10	4.06	4.06	4.20	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	245/1568	4.90	4.46	4.43	4.52	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1564	4.90	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1559	4.90	4.36	4.29	4.41	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	275/1352	4.56	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	2	3.90	886/1384	3.90	4.05	4.08	4.30	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.93	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.45	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.40	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 81	****	4.20	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.35	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 288	****	3.92	3.68	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 781 0101
 Title SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1449
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	2	5	3.83	1327/1649	3.83	4.30	4.28	4.46	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	5	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.18	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1138/1375	3.70	4.18	4.27	4.44	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	1021/1595	4.08	4.16	4.20	4.35	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.18	4.04	4.28	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	844/1512	4.08	4.05	4.10	4.35	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	416/1623	4.58	4.30	4.16	4.29	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.69	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1141/1621	3.82	4.06	4.06	4.20	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	3	1	2	3	2.92	1534/1568	2.92	4.46	4.43	4.52	2.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	1313/1572	4.42	4.72	4.70	4.83	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	3	3	3.50	1388/1564	3.50	4.31	4.28	4.41	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	4.36	4.29	4.41	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	690/1352	4.00	4.17	3.98	4.10	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	921/1384	3.83	4.05	4.08	4.30	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	831/1382	4.25	4.28	4.29	4.52	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	742/1368	4.42	4.34	4.30	4.56	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	601/ 948	3.75	3.93	3.95	4.03	3.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	50/ 88	4.60	4.45	4.54	4.63	4.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	75/ 85	3.80	4.40	4.47	4.50	3.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	55/ 81	4.20	4.20	4.43	4.43	4.20	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	54/ 92	4.40	4.35	4.35	4.42	4.40	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	20/ 288	4.80	3.92	3.68	3.87	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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