

Course-Section: PSYC 100 1  
 Title Intro To Psychology  
 Instructor: Garrett,Adia J  
 Enrollment: 209  
 Questionnaires: 123

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1244  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	0	6	14	29	72	4.38	745/1509	4.23	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	16	36	66	4.36	753/1509	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	6	19	41	52	4.10	886/1287	3.94	4.27	4.30	4.24	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	33	2	4	20	27	34	4.00	979/1459	3.87	4.28	4.22	4.11	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	4	2	3	13	28	69	4.38	462/1406	4.31	4.23	4.09	4.02	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	41	4	3	17	23	31	3.95	886/1384	3.69	4.12	4.11	3.98	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	15	27	77	4.50	458/1489	4.30	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	0	3	117	4.95	292/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	2	0	1	23	43	38	4.12	774/1463	3.90	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	2	12	33	69	4.40	940/1438	4.51	4.55	4.46	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	3	20	94	4.78	846/1421	4.69	4.80	4.73	4.66	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	4	11	39	62	4.37	768/1411	4.39	4.45	4.31	4.27	4.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	4	12	29	70	4.38	788/1405	4.29	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	3	4	7	31	70	4.40	354/1236	4.32	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	46	0	4	5	11	31	26	3.91	869/1260	3.86	4.25	4.14	3.95	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	3	3	20	18	32	3.96	939/1255	3.86	4.44	4.33	4.15	3.96
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	46	0	1	2	7	21	46	4.42	710/1258	4.18	4.42	4.38	4.18	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	47	16	1	9	15	17	18	3.70	636/ 873	3.65	4.00	4.03	3.89	3.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	110	1	2	0	3	3	4	3.58	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	111	0	2	0	2	4	4	3.67	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	111	2	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	112	3	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	112	3	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	113	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	115	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	114	5	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	114	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	114	3	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	114	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	114	0	2	0	2	2	3	3.44	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	114	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	114	3	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	114	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	114	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	113	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	113	2	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	114	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	114	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 1  
 Title Intro To Psychology  
 Instructor: Garrett, Adia J  
 Enrollment: 209  
 Questionnaires: 123

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1244  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	33	0.00-0.99	3	A	55	Required for Majors	42	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	48						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	12	General	55	Under-grad	123	Non-major	109
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	14	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 100 2  
 Title Intro To Psychology  
 Instructor: O'Brien,Eileen  
 Enrollment: 208  
 Questionnaires: 133

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1245  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	3	5	22	38	63	4.17	976/1509	4.23	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	6	26	50	47	4.02	1071/1509	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	10	21	48	49	3.97	962/1287	3.94	4.27	4.30	4.24	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	33	4	10	18	31	32	3.81	1159/1459	3.87	4.28	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	5	4	4	15	30	72	4.30	539/1406	4.31	4.23	4.09	4.02	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	65	8	6	14	18	18	3.50	1192/1384	3.69	4.12	4.11	3.98	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	1	2	9	11	35	71	4.28	728/1489	4.30	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	1	1	3	123	4.94	408/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	29	2	0	2	33	48	19	3.82	1044/1463	3.90	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	4	10	20	93	4.56	725/1438	4.51	4.55	4.46	4.44	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	6	26	96	4.70	968/1421	4.69	4.80	4.73	4.66	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	3	14	42	67	4.35	799/1411	4.39	4.45	4.31	4.27	4.35
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	5	10	16	26	69	4.14	974/1405	4.29	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	1	2	6	16	31	65	4.26	489/1236	4.32	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	105	0	0	3	6	11	8	3.86	****/1260	3.86	4.25	4.14	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	106	0	1	5	7	7	7	3.52	****/1255	3.86	4.44	4.33	4.15	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	106	0	2	2	8	8	7	3.59	****/1258	4.18	4.42	4.38	4.18	****
4. Were special techniques successful	106	1	1	2	6	11	6	3.73	****/ 873	3.65	4.00	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	128	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	129	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	129	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	129	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	129	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	131	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.31	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	131	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	131	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	131	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	130	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	130	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	130	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	130	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	130	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 2  
 Title Intro To Psychology  
 Instructor: O'Brien,Eileen  
 Enrollment: 208  
 Questionnaires: 133

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1245  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	39	0.00-0.99	5	A	54	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	16	1.00-1.99	1	B	50						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	10	General	67	Under-grad	133	Non-major	127
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	21	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						

Course-Section: PSYC 100 3  
 Title Intro To Psychology  
 Instructor: Nail,Jennifer  
 Enrollment: 199  
 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1246  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	1	4	17	31	41	4.14	1010/1509	4.23	4.38	4.31	4.18	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	5	12	40	36	4.12	1002/1509	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	3	9	22	33	27	3.77	1088/1287	3.94	4.27	4.30	4.24	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	2	5	18	21	21	3.81	1167/1459	3.87	4.28	4.22	4.11	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	1	14	28	46	4.26	575/1406	4.31	4.23	4.09	4.02	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	42	5	3	12	18	14	3.63	1126/1384	3.69	4.12	4.11	3.98	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	6	10	33	42	4.12	906/1489	4.30	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	1	38	52	4.53	1046/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.66	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	23	0	1	2	19	43	8	3.75	1101/1463	3.90	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	6	23	60	4.57	725/1438	4.51	4.55	4.46	4.44	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	7	22	60	4.60	1091/1421	4.69	4.80	4.73	4.66	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	9	25	53	4.45	689/1411	4.39	4.45	4.31	4.27	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	3	12	21	53	4.36	808/1405	4.29	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	3	3	7	27	49	4.30	451/1236	4.32	4.22	4.00	3.87	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	4	2	13	14	19	3.81	908/1260	3.86	4.25	4.14	3.95	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	2	4	17	11	18	3.75	1054/1255	3.86	4.44	4.33	4.15	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	1	6	12	9	24	3.94	980/1258	4.18	4.42	4.38	4.18	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	43	18	1	2	14	11	7	3.60	671/ 873	3.65	4.00	4.03	3.89	3.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	90	3	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.06	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	92	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.14	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	91	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	91	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	92	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.15	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	90	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	91	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.16	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	91	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	92	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	92	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	92	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	93	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.53	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	92	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.12	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	92	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	92	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	92	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	4.47	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	92	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.21	****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 3  
 Title Intro To Psychology  
 Instructor: Nail, Jennifer  
 Enrollment: 199  
 Questionnaires: 96

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1246  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	9	A	37	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	37						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	29	Under-grad	96	Non-major	89
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	15	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 1  
 Title Child Developmental Ps  
 Instructor: Garrett,Adia J  
 Enrollment: 95  
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1247  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	51	4.82	235/1509	4.76	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	47	4.74	278/1509	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	14	41	4.59	435/1287	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	12	45	4.70	247/1459	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	8	48	4.72	187/1406	4.55	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	15	40	4.55	313/1384	4.47	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	12	45	4.68	254/1489	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	32	28	4.47	1108/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	2	0	2	16	28	4.42	452/1463	4.58	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	49	4.75	447/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	59	4.97	215/1421	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	52	4.82	232/1411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	11	48	4.74	369/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	12	45	4.69	158/1236	4.72	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	7	33	4.82	194/1260	4.72	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	0	1	4	36	4.85	246/1255	4.78	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	4	37	4.90	236/1258	4.87	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	20	12	0	0	3	13	13	4.34	288/ 873	4.41	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.34
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.65	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	0	A 24	Required for Majors 31	Graduate 0	Major 24
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 27			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 11	Under-grad 61	Non-major 37
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 200 2  
 Title Child Developmental Ps  
 Instructor: Garrett,Adia J  
 Enrollment: 97  
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1248  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	0	20	46	4.60	482/1509	4.76	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	25	42	4.60	424/1509	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	19	43	4.54	481/1287	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	25	39	4.52	432/1459	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	16	50	4.72	187/1406	4.55	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	24	37	4.40	440/1384	4.47	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	6	12	48	4.64	308/1489	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	65	4.97	175/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	0	0	2	16	39	4.65	222/1463	4.58	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	17	49	4.72	514/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	63	4.93	429/1421	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	18	47	4.65	442/1411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	20	44	4.59	558/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	4	8	55	4.72	142/1236	4.72	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	11	24	4.69	294/1260	4.72	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	0	0	3	8	23	4.59	519/1255	4.78	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	299/1258	4.87	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	33	8	3	0	4	8	12	3.96	479/ 873	4.41	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.96
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	66	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.62	****
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 33	Required for Majors 36	Graduate 1 Major 21
28-55	14	1.00-1.99 0	B 24		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 12	Under-grad 67 Non-major 47
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 1		



Course-Section: PSYC 200 4  
 Title Child Developmental Ps  
 Instructor: Hussey-Gardner,  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1249  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	5	31	4.86	193/1509	4.76	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	150/1509	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	31	4.86	159/1287	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	9	23	4.67	280/1459	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	7	6	20	4.23	623/1406	4.55	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	5	7	19	4.45	394/1384	4.47	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	55/1489	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	1	0	0	5	22	4.68	203/1463	4.58	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	197/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1421	4.96	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	83/1411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	154/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	137/1236	4.72	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	316/1260	4.72	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	221/1255	4.78	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	299/1258	4.87	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	59/ 873	4.41	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	32	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	32	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	32	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 200 4  
 Title Child Developmental Ps  
 Instructor: Hussey-Gardner,  
 Enrollment: 43  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1249  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	17	Required for Majors	20	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	36	Non-major	26
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 210 1  
 Title Psychology Of Learning  
 Instructor: Borrero,John C  
 Enrollment: 102  
 Questionnaires: 79

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1250  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	22	53	4.64	434/1509	4.61	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	10	66	4.82	184/1509	4.74	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	15	61	4.76	261/1287	4.76	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	42	1	3	2	7	23	4.33	686/1459	4.41	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	13	5	14	13	28	3.52	1170/1406	3.94	4.23	4.09	4.09	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	63	2	1	1	2	9	4.00	****/1384	4.38	4.12	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	71	4.88	103/1489	4.89	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	59	17	4.22	1280/1506	4.60	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	1	14	49	4.75	151/1463	4.58	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	3	72	4.91	219/1438	4.91	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	76	5.00	1/1421	4.99	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	11	64	4.85	190/1411	4.79	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	71	4.93	120/1405	4.85	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	1	17	55	4.69	164/1236	4.64	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	44	0	0	0	4	14	17	4.37	528/1260	4.36	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	321/1255	4.58	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	337/1258	4.80	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	44	18	3	0	3	4	7	3.71	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	78	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 33	Required for Majors	48	Graduate	0	Major	34
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 0	B 27						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 13	C 4	General	4	Under-grad	79	Non-major	45
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 12	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	3				
			? 1						

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	5	8	29	4.57	516/1509	4.61	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	6	31	4.66	367/1509	4.74	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	33	4.76	250/1287	4.76	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	17	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	487/1459	4.41	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	6	7	26	4.37	478/1406	3.94	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.37
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	29	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	466/1384	4.38	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	92/1489	4.89	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	175/1506	4.60	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	19	16	4.42	452/1463	4.58	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	38	4.90	219/1438	4.91	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	161/1421	4.99	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	11	30	4.73	327/1411	4.79	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	8	32	4.76	345/1405	4.85	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	3	6	27	4.59	217/1236	4.64	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	543/1260	4.36	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	681/1255	4.58	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	409/1258	4.80	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	22	12	3	0	1	1	4	3.33	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	39	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 210 2  
 Title Psychology Of Learning  
 Instructor: Sigurdsson,Sigu  
 Enrollment: 96  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1251  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	21	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	43	Non-major	40
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 215 1  
 Title Paraprofessional Res C  
 Instructor: Leisey, Kimberly  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1252  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	5	10	10	4.20	942/1509	4.40	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	16	4.56	471/1509	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	250/1287	4.66	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	18	4.52	432/1459	4.45	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	4.44	400/1406	4.12	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	8	12	4.20	677/1384	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	485/1489	4.47	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	233/1506	4.96	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	500/1463	4.26	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	276/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	21	4.87	639/1421	4.76	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	376/1411	4.77	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	473/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	298/1236	4.48	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	323/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	402/1255	4.81	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	409/1258	4.68	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	178/ 873	4.66	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 25 Non-major 24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 10	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 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 215 2  
 Title Paraprofessional Res C  
 Instructor: Leisey, Kimberly (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1253  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	598/1509	4.40	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	683/1509	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	426/1287	4.66	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	11	12	4.42	602/1459	4.45	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	8	10	3.96	873/1406	4.12	4.23	4.09	4.09	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	619/1384	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	17	4.46	527/1489	4.47	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	292/1506	4.96	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	9	4.40	467/1463	4.26	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	531/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	483/1421	4.76	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	211/1411	4.77	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	251/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	354/1236	4.48	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	370/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	246/1255	4.81	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	521/1258	4.68	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	139/ 873	4.66	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.69

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 25 Non-major 24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 215 2  
 Title Paraprofessional Res C  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1254  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	598/1509	4.40	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	683/1509	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	426/1287	4.66	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	11	12	4.42	602/1459	4.45	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	2	8	10	3.96	873/1406	4.12	4.23	4.09	4.09	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	11	4.25	619/1384	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	4	17	4.46	527/1489	4.47	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	292/1506	4.96	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	11	5	4.00	853/1463	4.26	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	413/1438	4.79	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	1162/1421	4.76	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1411	4.77	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	321/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	236/1236	4.48	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.49
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	370/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	246/1255	4.81	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	521/1258	4.68	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	139/ 873	4.66	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.69

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 15	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 25 Non-major 24
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 6	
			? 0		



Course-Section: PSYC 216 1  
 Title Foundations Of Leaders  
 Instructor: Lennon,Nicholas  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1255  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	322/1509	4.70	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	12	4.45	590/1287	4.45	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	11	4.47	503/1459	4.47	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	11	4.40	446/1406	4.40	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	12	4.35	505/1384	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	7	9	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	309/1463	4.53	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	247/1438	4.88	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	93/1236	4.82	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	66/ 873	4.92	4.00	4.03	4.04	4.92
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 216 1  
 Title Foundations Of Leaders  
 Instructor: Lennon,Nicholas  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1255  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	14	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 230 1  
 Title Psychology And Culture  
 Instructor: Leung,Christy Y  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1256  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	5	6	21	9	2	2.93	1480/1509	2.93	4.38	4.31	4.34	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	5	6	20	10	2	2.95	1473/1509	2.95	4.30	4.26	4.32	2.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	5	13	14	8	2	2.74	1280/1287	2.74	4.27	4.30	4.35	2.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	4	5	20	5	7	3.15	1405/1459	3.15	4.28	4.22	4.30	3.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	5	4	18	11	4	3.12	1317/1406	3.12	4.23	4.09	4.09	3.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	6	15	10	7	3.24	1290/1384	3.24	4.12	4.11	4.09	3.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	10	11	12	8	3.33	1362/1489	3.33	4.30	4.17	4.19	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	18	4.42	1156/1506	4.42	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	2	10	20	4	3	2.90	1411/1463	2.90	4.16	4.09	4.08	2.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	0	10	16	15	3.98	1222/1438	3.98	4.55	4.46	4.48	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	6	15	20	4.26	1289/1421	4.26	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.26
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	5	16	12	6	3.37	1315/1411	3.37	4.45	4.31	4.37	3.37
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	7	12	8	12	3.45	1279/1405	3.45	4.47	4.32	4.39	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	3	11	12	13	3.76	853/1236	3.76	4.22	4.00	4.11	3.76
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	3	5	4	4	3.28	1115/1260	3.28	4.25	4.14	4.19	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	2	0	3	7	7	3.89	996/1255	3.89	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	873/1258	4.16	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.16
4. Were special techniques successful	26	6	0	2	3	3	4	3.75	610/ 873	3.75	4.00	4.03	4.04	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	16	Under-grad	44	Non-major	35
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 1  
 Title Abnormal Psychology  
 Instructor: Freiberg, Karen  
 Enrollment: 167  
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1257  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	4	8	20	57	4.42	698/1509	4.51	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	11	28	47	4.30	807/1509	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.30
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	9	23	55	4.44	590/1287	4.46	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	29	2	3	4	22	29	4.22	814/1459	4.29	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	9	12	61	4.44	400/1406	4.36	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	75	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	****/1384	4.06	4.12	4.11	4.09	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	13	22	50	4.29	728/1489	4.45	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	1	82	6	4.03	1371/1506	4.67	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.03
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	2	1	8	40	30	4.17	714/1463	4.11	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	11	22	54	4.43	904/1438	4.61	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	5	6	76	4.75	881/1421	4.82	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	3	7	20	56	4.46	677/1411	4.51	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	4	3	20	59	4.48	671/1405	4.56	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	2	4	7	20	55	4.39	373/1236	4.54	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	39	0	10	6	9	13	14	3.29	1113/1260	3.65	4.25	4.14	4.19	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	4	5	13	14	18	3.69	1077/1255	3.84	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	38	0	4	4	8	13	24	3.92	996/1258	4.01	4.42	4.38	4.44	3.92
4. Were special techniques successful	36	46	3	3	1	1	1	2.33	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	81	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	85	0	2	0	0	0	4	3.67	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	87	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	87	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	87	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	86	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	88	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	88	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	88	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	88	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	87	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	89	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	87	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	88	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	88	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	88	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	88	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: PSYC 285 1  
 Title Abnormal Psychology  
 Instructor: Freiberg, Karen  
 Enrollment: 167  
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1257  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	13	0.00-0.99	4	A	45	Required for Majors	50	Graduate	1	Major	20
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	10	Under-grad	90	Non-major	71
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	13	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	13	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 2  
 Title Abnormal Psychology  
 Instructor: Rice,Sara Carri  
 Enrollment: 64  
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1258  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	2	7	24	4.67	410/1509	4.51	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	10	21	4.53	519/1509	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	2	11	19	4.38	658/1287	4.46	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	15	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	553/1459	4.29	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	6	5	22	4.48	354/1406	4.36	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	18	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	557/1384	4.06	4.12	4.11	4.09	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	8	26	4.76	183/1489	4.45	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	34	5.00	1/1506	4.67	4.75	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	17	6	4.04	836/1463	4.11	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.04
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	30	4.88	247/1438	4.61	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	614/1421	4.82	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	7	25	4.62	482/1411	4.51	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	3	26	4.53	615/1405	4.56	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	4	5	24	4.61	211/1236	4.54	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	2	1	6	8	4.18	676/1260	3.65	4.25	4.14	4.19	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	755/1255	3.84	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	650/1258	4.01	4.42	4.38	4.44	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	19	15	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 25	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 14					
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 3	General	2	Under-grad	36	Non-major 18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	0			
				? 0					

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	5	0	0	1	4	13	26	4.45	661/1509	4.51	4.38	4.31	4.34	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	3	3	13	25	4.36	742/1509	4.40	4.30	4.26	4.32	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	4	12	28	4.55	481/1287	4.46	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	7	0	2	7	9	19	4.22	814/1459	4.29	4.28	4.22	4.30	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	3	6	12	22	4.16	693/1406	4.36	4.23	4.09	4.09	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	4	1	4	10	9	14	3.82	1009/1384	4.06	4.12	4.11	4.09	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	2	7	7	27	4.30	717/1489	4.45	4.30	4.17	4.19	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	1	41	4.98	175/1506	4.67	4.75	4.67	4.61	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	5	18	9	4.13	774/1463	4.11	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	3	2	7	31	4.53	762/1438	4.61	4.55	4.46	4.48	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	0	4	39	4.84	691/1421	4.82	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.84
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	5	8	28	4.44	689/1411	4.51	4.45	4.31	4.37	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	5	35	4.67	446/1405	4.56	4.47	4.32	4.39	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	0	2	11	28	4.63	193/1236	4.54	4.22	4.00	4.11	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	4	1	5	3	8	3.48	1058/1260	3.65	4.25	4.14	4.19	3.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	4	2	4	2	10	3.55	1117/1255	3.84	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	4	1	4	3	10	3.64	1114/1258	4.01	4.42	4.38	4.44	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	28	14	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.51	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	48	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	48	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	48	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 20	Required for Majors 20	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 49	Non-major 40
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough	

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



Course-Section: PSYC 304 1  
 Title Adolescent Psychology  
 Instructor: Freiberg, Karen  
 Enrollment: 142  
 Questionnaires: 84

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1260  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	2	6	9	24	41	4.17	964/1509	4.17	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	5	10	24	42	4.23	880/1509	4.23	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	6	10	21	45	4.28	755/1287	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	50	1	2	2	11	16	4.22	814/1459	4.22	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	2	6	24	42	4.22	635/1406	4.22	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	61	1	1	3	5	9	4.05	****/1384	****	4.12	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	9	14	57	4.57	387/1489	4.57	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	3	8	66	3	3.86	1454/1506	3.86	4.75	4.67	4.67	3.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	2	1	1	12	27	23	4.09	804/1463	4.09	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	6	22	50	4.53	762/1438	4.53	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	2	3	8	63	4.74	915/1421	4.74	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	2	11	17	48	4.42	713/1411	4.42	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	4	2	7	20	44	4.27	881/1405	4.27	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	3	2	4	15	53	4.47	306/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	2	0	8	12	27	4.27	613/1260	4.27	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	1	0	4	6	38	4.63	474/1255	4.63	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	35	0	0	2	2	2	43	4.76	421/1258	4.76	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	35	30	3	1	1	4	10	3.89	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	74	7	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	79	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	79	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	80	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	80	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	77	3	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	78	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	78	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	78	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	78	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	82	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	81	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	81	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	81	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	81	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	81	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	81	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	81	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	81	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 304 1  
 Title Adolescent Psychology  
 Instructor: Freiberg, Karen  
 Enrollment: 142  
 Questionnaires: 84

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1260  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	28	Required for Majors	41	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	34						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	8	C	5	General	4	Under-grad	84	Non-major	49
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	19	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	235/1509	4.81	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	796/1509	4.31	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	12	12	4.63	403/1287	4.63	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	520/1459	4.47	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	332/1406	4.50	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	260/1384	4.63	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	555/1489	4.44	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1182/1506	4.38	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	726/1463	4.17	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	1063/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	738/1411	4.40	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	489/1236	4.25	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	272/1260	4.71	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	468/1258	4.71	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	853/ 873	2.50	4.00	4.03	4.08	2.50
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors		4	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	2							
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General		3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives		5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				



Course-Section: PSYC 308 1  
 Title Child Maltreatment  
 Instructor: O'Brien,Eileen  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1262  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	15	17	4.24	901/1509	4.24	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	16	16	4.27	838/1509	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	14	14	4.08	894/1287	4.08	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	14	16	4.18	843/1459	4.18	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	16	17	4.24	599/1406	4.24	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	4	4	15	10	3.85	978/1384	3.85	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	10	25	4.57	387/1489	4.57	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	350/1506	4.95	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	7	18	5	3.93	944/1463	3.93	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	32	4.84	319/1438	4.84	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	32	4.86	639/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	5	29	4.70	363/1411	4.70	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	26	4.62	513/1405	4.62	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	3	29	4.69	158/1236	4.69	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	4	5	14	4.16	681/1260	4.16	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	2	5	16	4.36	698/1255	4.36	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	3	19	4.64	521/1258	4.64	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	0	3	2	4	12	4.19	366/ 873	4.19	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.19

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 2	Under-grad 38 Non-major 23
84-150	11	3.00-3.49 10	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 317 1  
 Title Cognitive Psychology  
 Instructor: Groninger,Lowel  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1263  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	5	5	8	3.90	1214/1509	4.18	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	4	7	5	3.60	1331/1509	4.07	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	3	6	5	3.40	1188/1287	3.84	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	4	7	3.80	1167/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	656/1406	4.34	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	3	4	6	2	2.95	1335/1384	3.66	4.12	4.11	4.15	2.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	986/1489	4.33	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	583/1506	4.56	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	5	6	2	3.17	1364/1463	3.79	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	603/1438	4.70	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	1162/1421	4.71	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	3	6	6	3.68	1228/1411	4.06	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	6	8	3.90	1132/1405	4.28	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	1	3	4	9	3.89	779/1236	4.23	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	1	3	4	3.64	996/1260	3.94	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1094/1255	4.03	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	591/1258	4.49	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	10	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.88	4.00	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

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	2	0	1	0	2	11	21	4.46	661/1509	4.18	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	12	21	4.54	495/1509	4.07	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	8	7	20	4.28	763/1287	3.84	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	1	2	5	22	4.60	346/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	10	22	4.47	366/1406	4.34	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	1	1	1	9	17	4.38	479/1384	3.66	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	7	27	4.67	276/1489	4.33	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	25	10	4.22	1280/1506	4.56	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	2	15	15	4.41	467/1463	3.79	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	463/1438	4.70	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	33	4.91	483/1421	4.71	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	13	19	4.43	713/1411	4.06	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	26	4.66	473/1405	4.28	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.66
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	2	8	23	4.56	242/1236	4.23	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	6	6	16	4.24	629/1260	3.94	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	4	6	19	4.43	638/1255	4.03	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	690/1258	4.49	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	2	1	2	4	8	3.88	545/ 873	3.88	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	36
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 6
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	3

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

Course-Section: PSYC 324 1  
 Title Intro Interview Techn  
 Instructor: Rudow,Edward  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1265  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	540/1509	4.55	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	424/1509	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	739/1287	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	1	2	3	8	4.07	938/1459	4.07	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	231/1406	4.65	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	17	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	990/1506	4.60	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	762/1463	4.13	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	775/1438	4.53	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	828/1421	4.79	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	456/1411	4.63	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	309/1405	4.79	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	4	2	6	3.92	752/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	258/1260	4.73	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	237/1255	4.87	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	536/ 873	3.91	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	20	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PSYC 330 1  
 Title Child Devel And Cultur  
 Instructor: Cheah,Charissa  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1266  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	7	5	15	4.30	842/1509	4.39	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	19	4.67	356/1509	4.49	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	435/1287	4.59	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	14	9	4.24	792/1459	4.31	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	4	5	14	4.04	790/1406	4.07	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	12	11	4.22	649/1384	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	276/1489	4.62	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	16	4.62	981/1506	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	13	6	4.19	690/1463	4.23	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	22	4.78	413/1438	4.64	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	20	4.63	469/1411	4.64	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	21	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	12	13	4.41	354/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	4	14	4.48	442/1260	4.62	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.48
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	287/1255	4.79	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	299/1258	4.83	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	6	8	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	389/ 873	4.19	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.15

Frequency Distribution

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

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	2	0	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	623/1509	4.39	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	785/1509	4.49	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1287	4.59	4.27	4.30	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	6	4	16	4.38	638/1459	4.31	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	6	14	4.11	739/1406	4.07	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	367/1384	4.35	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	2	21	4.57	376/1489	4.62	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	0	25	4.92	466/1506	4.77	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	608/1463	4.23	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	5	19	4.50	800/1438	4.64	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	26	4.89	562/1421	4.89	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	7	20	4.64	442/1411	4.64	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	22	4.68	446/1405	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	255/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	237/1260	4.62	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	1	23	4.77	333/1255	4.79	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	2	23	4.81	363/1258	4.83	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.81
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	1	0	4	6	12	4.22	355/ 873	4.19	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.22
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	Major 12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Under-grad 29
				P 0	Non-major 17
					Electives 6
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	0
?	0		

Course-Section: PSYC 331 1  
 Title Experimental Psych I  
 Instructor: Stapleton,Laura  
 Enrollment: 92  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1268  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	470/1509	4.66	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	311/1509	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	348/1287	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	22	4.70	247/1459	4.61	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	8	16	4.27	575/1406	3.84	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	7	17	4.46	385/1384	3.94	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	200/1489	4.26	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	233/1506	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	110/1463	4.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	28	4.87	262/1438	4.82	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	30	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	180/1411	4.67	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	27	4.81	285/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	2	5	22	4.45	314/1236	4.34	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	535/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	474/1255	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	3	14	4.53	605/1258	3.85	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	224/ 873	4.20	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.47
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	1	1	1	2	14	4.42	64/ 184	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.07	4.42
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	29/ 198	4.60	4.69	4.22	4.17	4.79
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	2	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	38/ 184	4.68	4.62	4.48	4.52	4.82
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	50/ 177	4.57	4.68	4.36	4.30	4.74
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	9	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	88/ 165	4.30	4.60	4.18	4.11	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 331 1  
 Title Experimental Psych I  
 Instructor: Stapleton, Laura  
 Enrollment: 92  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1268  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	23	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major	10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 11  
 Title Experimental Psych I  
 Instructor: Alonso,Diane L  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1269  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	9	21	4.59	493/1509	4.66	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	2	6	21	4.45	621/1509	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	1	2	6	20	4.32	718/1287	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	13	16	4.31	705/1459	4.61	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	8	16	4.16	693/1406	3.84	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	4	10	15	4.09	756/1384	3.94	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	4	26	4.72	224/1489	4.26	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	20	11	4.35	1194/1506	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	16	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	826/1463	4.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	8	19	4.47	852/1438	4.82	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	537/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	4	9	15	4.16	957/1411	4.67	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	7	18	4.32	838/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	4	6	17	4.48	290/1236	4.34	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	7	4	9	3.82	904/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	0	4	4	12	4.09	877/1255	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	3	1	4	1	13	3.91	1013/1258	3.85	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	405/ 873	4.20	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.13
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	8	0	7	3	11	3.31	173/ 184	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.07	3.31
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	2	2	2	9	14	4.07	119/ 198	4.60	4.69	4.22	4.17	4.07
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	3	1	1	1	4	19	4.50	105/ 184	4.68	4.62	4.48	4.52	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	3	3	5	17	4.17	128/ 177	4.57	4.68	4.36	4.30	4.17
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	2	1	1	2	5	18	4.41	68/ 165	4.30	4.60	4.18	4.11	4.41
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	1	1	0	1	4	3.86	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	0	1	4	3.71	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	3	0	0	0	2	2.60	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 331 11  
 Title Experimental Psych I  
 Instructor: Alonso,Diane L  
 Enrollment: 44  
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1269  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	9	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 2  
 Title Experimental Psych I  
 Instructor: Stapleton, Laura  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1270  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.66	4.38	4.31	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1287	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	4.61	4.28	4.22	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.84	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1322/1384	3.94	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1403/1489	4.26	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	4.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	4.82	4.55	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	4.67	4.45	4.31	4.29	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	664/1236	4.34	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.37	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1222/1258	3.85	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.20	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PSYC 331 6  
 Title Experimental Psych I  
 Instructor: Pitts, Steven C  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1271  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	0	1	2	16	22	4.44	686/1509	4.66	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	3	9	27	4.62	412/1509	4.69	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	7	31	4.68	337/1287	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	0	6	7	20	4.42	586/1459	4.61	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	4	1	8	6	19	3.92	909/1406	3.84	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	15	0	1	5	8	12	4.19	677/1384	3.94	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	8	29	4.59	364/1489	4.26	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	2	38	4.85	682/1506	4.79	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	16	18	4.49	353/1463	4.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	175/1438	4.82	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	429/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	2	6	30	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	2	10	27	4.64	486/1405	4.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	0	1	4	6	19	4.43	330/1236	4.34	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	1	4	3	14	4.22	653/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	3	4	4	11	3.91	983/1255	4.41	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	9	6	8	3.96	972/1258	3.85	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.96
4. Were special techniques successful	20	18	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 873	4.20	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	47/ 184	4.08	4.23	4.16	4.07	4.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	14/ 198	4.60	4.69	4.22	4.17	4.94
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	5	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	60/ 184	4.68	4.62	4.48	4.52	4.73
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	35/ 177	4.57	4.68	4.36	4.30	4.80
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	7	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	****/ 165	4.30	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	39	0	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	39	0	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	39	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	39	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	39	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	39	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	39	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	39	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	39	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 331 6  
 Title Experimental Psych I  
 Instructor: Pitts, Steven C  
 Enrollment: 72  
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1271  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
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	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: Blass,Thomas (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1272  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	14	6	3.63	1359/1509	3.62	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	9	7	3.44	1394/1509	3.61	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	13	8	6	3.41	1188/1287	3.57	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	10	11	3.91	1088/1459	3.98	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	5	7	10	3.42	1231/1406	3.30	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	11	13	4.00	807/1384	3.98	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	7	9	10	3.68	1232/1489	3.79	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	19	4.55	1038/1506	4.68	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	7	7	12	1	3.26	1338/1463	3.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	4	1	8	11	8	3.56	1363/1438	3.94	4.55	4.46	4.43	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	2	5	22	4.41	1217/1421	4.17	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	4	9	9	5	3.16	1347/1411	3.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	8	12	8	3.69	1213/1405	3.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	4	0	7	6	5	3.36	1045/1236	3.42	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	7	8	7	3.58	1021/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	776/1255	4.19	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	8	11	4.08	910/1258	3.90	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	786/ 873	3.41	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.15
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: Blass,Thomas (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1272  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	10	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1273  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	14	6	3.63	1359/1509	3.62	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	9	7	3.44	1394/1509	3.61	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	13	8	6	3.41	1188/1287	3.57	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	10	11	3.91	1088/1459	3.98	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	5	7	10	3.42	1231/1406	3.30	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	11	13	4.00	807/1384	3.98	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	7	9	10	3.68	1232/1489	3.79	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	19	4.55	1038/1506	4.68	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	2	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	702/1463	3.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	1086/1438	3.94	4.55	4.46	4.43	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	1228/1421	4.17	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	758/1411	3.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	859/1405	3.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	6	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	****/1236	3.42	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	7	8	7	3.58	1021/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	776/1255	4.19	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	8	11	4.08	910/1258	3.90	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	786/ 873	3.41	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.15
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1273  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	10	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1274  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	8	14	6	3.63	1359/1509	3.62	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	5	9	9	7	3.44	1394/1509	3.61	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	13	8	6	3.41	1188/1287	3.57	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	9	10	11	3.91	1088/1459	3.98	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	4	5	7	10	3.42	1231/1406	3.30	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	2	11	13	4.00	807/1384	3.98	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	7	9	10	3.68	1232/1489	3.79	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	11	19	4.55	1038/1506	4.68	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	0	1	6	6	1	3.50	1241/1463	3.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	5	7	2	3.79	1304/1438	3.94	4.55	4.46	4.43	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	1306/1421	4.17	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.34
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	1	4	4	5	3.93	1126/1411	3.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	7	5	1	3.54	1257/1405	3.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	8	1	2	0	2	1	3.00	****/1236	3.42	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	1	7	8	7	3.58	1021/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	3	10	12	4.27	776/1255	4.19	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.27
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	6	8	11	4.08	910/1258	3.90	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.08
4. Were special techniques successful	8	11	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	786/ 873	3.41	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.15
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 332 1  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1274  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	10	Required for Majors	24	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	32	Non-major	8
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	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	0				
				?	1						



Course-Section: PSYC 332 10  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: Garrett, Adia J  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1275  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	778/1509	3.62	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	300/1509	3.61	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	381/1287	3.57	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	302/1459	3.98	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1087/1406	3.30	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	225/1384	3.98	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	376/1489	3.79	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	682/1506	4.68	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	396/1463	3.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	712/1438	3.94	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	1162/1421	4.17	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	789/1411	3.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	3	9	4.36	808/1405	3.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	580/1236	3.42	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	528/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	484/1255	4.19	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	620/1258	3.90	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	383/ 873	3.41	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 5  
 Title Experimental Psych II  
 Instructor: Groninger,Lowel  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1276  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	4	2	0	2.89	1484/1509	3.62	4.38	4.31	4.32	2.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1463/1509	3.61	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	2	1	3.00	1247/1287	3.57	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1292/1459	3.98	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	2	3	0	2.56	1390/1406	3.30	4.23	4.09	4.12	2.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	4	1	3.22	1292/1384	3.98	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1359/1489	3.79	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	622/1506	4.68	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	1	2	0	2.57	1439/1463	3.59	4.16	4.09	4.08	2.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1364/1438	3.94	4.55	4.46	4.43	3.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1404/1421	4.17	4.80	4.73	4.73	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	1	3	1	2.89	1380/1411	3.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	2.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	2	1	2.56	1387/1405	3.69	4.47	4.32	4.32	2.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	1179/1236	3.42	4.22	4.00	4.07	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1120/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1127/1255	4.19	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	1244/1258	3.90	4.42	4.38	4.42	2.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	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 8	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 9	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

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	2	0	4	8	21	32	39	3.90	1214/1509	4.18	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	10	9	29	23	32	3.56	1347/1509	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	10	19	22	26	26	3.38	1195/1287	3.60	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	15	14	20	29	15	3.16	1402/1459	3.67	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	14	14	34	35	3.81	1001/1406	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	22	15	29	20	16	2.93	1337/1384	3.28	4.12	4.11	4.15	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	3	6	12	22	59	4.25	760/1489	4.35	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	1	0	0	101	4.97	175/1506	4.99	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	27	1	9	9	24	23	13	3.28	1329/1463	3.64	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	6	12	17	28	38	3.79	1300/1438	4.30	4.55	4.46	4.43	3.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	5	4	22	71	4.56	1123/1421	4.68	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	13	9	28	29	22	3.38	1313/1411	4.04	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	7	10	16	27	42	3.85	1154/1405	4.23	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	52	10	9	14	8	6	2.81	1174/1236	3.80	4.22	4.00	4.07	2.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	47	0	16	6	13	11	13	2.98	1169/1260	3.32	4.25	4.14	4.22	2.98
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	9	6	15	13	16	3.36	1163/1255	3.68	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	47	0	12	10	11	11	15	3.12	1216/1258	3.73	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.12
4. Were special techniques successful	47	49	3	3	0	1	3	2.80	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	103	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	103	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	104	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	104	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	103	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	103	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	104	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	104	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	103	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	104	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	104	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 24	Required for Majors 81	Graduate 0 Major 71
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 1	B 50		
56-83	16	2.00-2.99 15	C 18	General 4	Under-grad 106 Non-major 35
84-150	33	3.00-3.49 16	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 24	F 0	Electives 8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 335 2  
 Title Physiological Psycholo  
 Instructor: Lynch,Minda R  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1278  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	661/1509	4.18	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	838/1509	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	4	4	3.82	1069/1287	3.60	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	843/1459	3.67	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	563/1406	4.04	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	2	4	3.64	1126/1384	3.28	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	527/1489	4.35	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.99	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	853/1463	3.64	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	363/1438	4.30	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	794/1421	4.68	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	376/1411	4.04	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	540/1405	4.23	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	100/1236	3.80	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	982/1260	3.32	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	904/1255	3.68	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	770/1258	3.73	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 340 1  
 Title Social Psychology  
 Instructor: Bediako, Shawn M  
 Enrollment: 65  
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1279  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	13	24	4.46	648/1509	4.53	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	9	30	4.66	367/1509	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	11	29	4.66	370/1287	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.66
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	1	0	4	4	19	4.43	586/1459	4.38	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	32	4.68	208/1406	4.66	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.68
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	23	1	1	2	5	9	4.11	742/1384	3.72	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	33	4.73	208/1489	4.76	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	30	4.73	870/1506	4.87	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	1	14	16	4.30	579/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	37	4.93	175/1438	4.78	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	36	4.88	614/1421	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	33	4.82	222/1411	4.72	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	33	4.75	345/1405	4.80	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	9	26	4.58	229/1236	4.43	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	2	7	15	4.40	505/1260	4.55	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	463/1255	4.63	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	312/1258	4.77	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.84
4. Were special techniques successful	16	3	3	3	2	6	8	3.59	674/ 873	3.30	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.59
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	40	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	29	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	18
84-150	15	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	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 340 2  
 Title Social Psychology  
 Instructor: Rudow,Edward  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1280  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	6	9	4.60	482/1509	4.53	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	201/1509	4.73	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	566/1287	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	686/1459	4.38	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	238/1406	4.66	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1264/1384	3.72	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	167/1489	4.76	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	4.87	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	325/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	617/1438	4.78	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	429/1421	4.90	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	482/1411	4.72	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	228/1405	4.80	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	474/1236	4.43	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	287/1260	4.55	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	494/1255	4.63	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	486/1258	4.77	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.30	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.00
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 342 1  
 Title Psych Of Aggression  
 Instructor: Anderson,Robert  
 Enrollment: 81  
 Questionnaires: 72

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1281  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	0	0	0	2	8	62	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	17	53	4.72	300/1509	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	14	58	4.81	208/1287	4.81	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	4	0	7	19	33	4.22	803/1459	4.22	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	21	45	4.51	332/1406	4.51	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.51
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	3	8	22	35	4.17	701/1384	4.17	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	6	15	17	32	4.07	937/1489	4.07	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	64	4.90	583/1506	4.90	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	14	57	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	14	54	4.74	463/1438	4.74	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	70	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	14	54	4.74	315/1411	4.74	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	64	4.91	154/1405	4.91	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	8	21	39	4.46	314/1236	4.46	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	3	10	27	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	1	2	7	30	4.65	453/1255	4.65	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	0	0	1	8	30	4.74	433/1258	4.74	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.74
4. Were special techniques successful	33	22	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	71	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	68	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	68	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	68	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	68	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	68	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	71	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	71	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	71	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 32	Required for Majors 27	Graduate 0	Major 36
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 22			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 72	Non-major 36
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	15	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 25	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 357 1  
 Title Psyc Of Women  
 Instructor: O'Brien,Eileen  
 Enrollment: 50  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1282  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	5	5	26	4.39	734/1509	4.39	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	4	5	8	21	4.21	901/1509	4.21	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	10	8	15	3.79	1081/1287	3.79	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	4	3	11	16	3.97	1011/1459	3.97	4.28	4.22	4.26	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	1	7	25	4.26	575/1406	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	7	7	19	4.05	779/1384	4.05	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	3	6	9	18	4.17	854/1489	4.17	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	4	14	12	4.19	690/1463	4.19	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	5	1	30	4.62	646/1438	4.62	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	33	4.86	639/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	4	27	4.54	568/1411	4.54	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	5	1	27	4.30	866/1405	4.30	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	1	3	5	24	4.37	383/1236	4.37	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	5	3	14	4.26	613/1260	4.26	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	3	2	18	4.65	453/1255	4.65	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.65
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	0	5	3	14	4.26	813/1258	4.26	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.26
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	2	5	2	9	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0	Major 25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 39	Non-major 14
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			



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	11	8	12	8	6	2.78	1487/1509	2.78	4.38	4.31	4.32	2.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	7	7	17	5	8	3.00	1463/1509	3.00	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	6	6	13	11	9	3.24	1222/1287	3.24	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	39	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	****/1459	****	4.28	4.22	4.26	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	3	6	11	12	7	4	2.80	1369/1406	2.80	4.23	4.09	4.12	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	40	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/1384	****	4.12	4.11	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	3	3	8	9	19	3.90	1106/1489	3.90	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	10	14	18	4.12	1340/1506	4.12	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.12
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	8	8	11	8	1	2.61	1438/1463	2.61	4.16	4.09	4.08	2.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	6	12	22	4.23	1086/1438	4.23	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	11	11	19	4.14	1322/1421	4.14	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	6	9	10	10	7	3.07	1356/1411	3.07	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	10	10	9	11	3.40	1294/1405	3.40	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	11	5	2	9	6	8	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	10	2	9	3	1	2.32	1249/1260	2.32	4.25	4.14	4.22	2.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	9	4	4	5	3	2.56	1238/1255	2.56	4.44	4.33	4.37	2.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	6	6	7	3	3	2.64	1247/1258	2.64	4.42	4.38	4.42	2.64
4. Were special techniques successful	21	22	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	45	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	45	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	44	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	44	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 28	Graduate 1	Major 37
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 19			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 9	General 0	Under-grad 45	Non-major 9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D 3			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 4		
				? 1			

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	4	11	17	26	23	3.65	1345/1509	3.65	4.38	4.31	4.32	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	11	12	20	26	12	3.20	1442/1509	3.20	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	1	5	24	14	21	16	3.24	1223/1287	3.24	4.27	4.30	4.33	3.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	8	15	16	19	14	9	2.81	1450/1459	2.81	4.28	4.22	4.26	2.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	2	8	7	15	29	18	3.55	1162/1406	3.55	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	12	1	20	18	22	14	4	2.54	1369/1384	2.54	4.12	4.11	4.15	2.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	3	7	8	20	40	4.12	906/1489	4.12	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	1	78	4.99	117/1506	4.99	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	21	2	3	13	30	15	7	3.15	1370/1463	3.15	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	6	5	21	20	28	3.74	1322/1438	3.74	4.55	4.46	4.43	3.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	2	6	23	48	4.44	1200/1421	4.44	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	9	16	22	22	11	3.13	1351/1411	3.13	4.45	4.31	4.29	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	10	8	20	20	22	3.45	1279/1405	3.45	4.47	4.32	4.32	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	13	8	3	14	22	17	3.58	950/1236	3.58	4.22	4.00	4.07	3.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	53	0	7	7	5	11	8	3.16	1140/1260	3.16	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.16
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	52	0	6	4	11	9	9	3.28	1175/1255	3.28	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	52	0	8	1	10	10	10	3.33	1184/1258	3.33	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	52	31	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	89	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	88	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	88	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	88	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	88	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	88	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	89	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors	57	Graduate 0	Major 52
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 37				
56-83	11	2.00-2.99 8	C 8	General	1	Under-grad 91	Non-major 39
84-150	25	3.00-3.49 18	D 1				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	2		
			? 1				

Course-Section: PSYC 380 1  
 Title Personality  
 Instructor: Resta, S P  
 Enrollment: 78  
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1285  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	6	0	0	0	7	9	17	4.30	833/1509	4.30	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	1	8	23	4.58	459/1509	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	7	25	4.73	293/1287	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	4	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	400/1459	4.55	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	2	1	0	1	12	17	4.42	434/1406	4.42	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	1	3	10	17	4.39	466/1384	4.39	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	2	8	22	4.55	411/1489	4.55	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	1	0	0	2	29	4.81	762/1506	4.81	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	3	7	17	4.43	438/1463	4.43	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	153/1438	4.93	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	376/1421	4.93	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	291/1411	4.77	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	2	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	363/1236	4.39	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.39
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	856/1260	3.92	4.25	4.14	4.22	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	2	1	3	5	3.75	1054/1255	3.75	4.44	4.33	4.37	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	1	4	1	5	3.67	1102/1258	3.67	4.42	4.38	4.42	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	27	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	22	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	39	Non-major	25
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 382 1  
 Title Child/Adol Psychopathl  
 Instructor: Dahlquist,Lynnnd  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1286  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	4	27	4.87	184/1509	4.87	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	234/1509	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	250/1287	4.77	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	19	4.55	410/1459	4.55	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	7	18	4.26	587/1406	4.26	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	4	7	17	4.23	649/1384	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	25	4.71	233/1489	4.71	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	233/1506	4.97	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	118/1463	4.81	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	219/1438	4.90	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	215/1421	4.97	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	180/1411	4.87	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	69/1405	4.97	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	93/1236	4.83	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	308/1260	4.67	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	262/1255	4.83	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	19	8	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 14	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 11					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General	1	Under-grad	31	Non-major 8
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	7	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	1			
				? 0					

Course-Section: PSYC 385 1  
 Title Health Psychology  
 Instructor: Anderson,Robert  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1287  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	48	4.82	227/1509	4.82	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	13	44	4.77	234/1509	4.77	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	48	4.79	229/1287	4.79	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	7	13	29	4.40	619/1459	4.40	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	8	44	4.63	253/1406	4.63	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	9	13	31	4.27	609/1384	4.27	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	4	10	17	22	3.91	1094/1489	3.91	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	2	0	0	0	3	51	4.94	350/1506	4.94	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	12	43	4.72	177/1463	4.72	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.72
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	52	4.93	175/1438	4.93	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	56	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	10	46	4.82	222/1411	4.82	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	51	4.91	154/1405	4.91	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	12	2	1	8	14	16	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	9	19	4.68	301/1260	4.68	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.68
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	1	0	0	4	23	4.71	390/1255	4.71	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	189/1258	4.93	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	29	13	1	4	2	2	6	3.53	694/ 873	3.53	4.00	4.03	4.08	3.53
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 385 1  
 Title Health Psychology  
 Instructor: Anderson,Robert  
 Enrollment: 69  
 Questionnaires: 57

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1287  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	21	Required for Majors	28	Graduate	0	Major	32
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	57	Non-major	25
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	14	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 387 1  
 Title Community Psychology  
 Instructor: Brodsky, Anne E  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1288  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	1	6	15	4.28	852/1509	4.28	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	9	13	4.32	785/1509	4.32	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	8	13	4.48	554/1287	4.48	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	7	14	4.28	737/1459	4.28	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	6	15	4.24	611/1406	4.24	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	3	8	11	3.96	859/1384	3.96	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	3	4	15	4.25	760/1489	4.25	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	1	0	0	0	23	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	0	3	7	8	3.95	918/1463	3.95	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	1	21	4.78	396/1438	4.78	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	0	22	4.83	742/1421	4.83	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	0	6	15	4.55	568/1411	4.55	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	4	17	4.64	499/1405	4.64	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	1	4	5	11	4.09	620/1236	4.09	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	17	4.65	316/1260	4.65	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	0	0	2	16	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	5	3	10	4.11	417/ 873	4.11	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.11
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 387 1  
 Title Community Psychology  
 Instructor: Brodsky, Anne E  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1288  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	9	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						



Course-Section: PSYC 393 1  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Freiberg, Karen  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1289  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	2	0	1	0	0	1	23	4.80	244/1509	4.70	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	0	6	16	4.50	543/1509	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	261/1287	4.55	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	1	0	1	5	16	4.52	432/1459	4.54	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	200/1406	4.58	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	7	14	4.29	579/1384	4.32	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	3	1	18	4.57	387/1489	4.60	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	4	14	5	4.04	1368/1506	4.59	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	325/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	7	15	4.57	725/1438	4.84	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	1	21	4.83	742/1421	4.78	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	1	6	15	4.52	592/1411	4.68	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	17	4.61	540/1405	4.74	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	2	2	1	18	4.52	261/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	574/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	287/1255	4.37	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	363/1258	4.57	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	1	0	2	10	4.36	283/ 873	4.43	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.36
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 393 1  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Freiberg, Karen  
 Enrollment: 46  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1289  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	14	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 393 2  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Rowland,Laura M  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1290  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	244/1509	4.70	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	245/1509	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	127/1287	4.55	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	227/1459	4.54	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	423/1406	4.58	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	107/1384	4.32	4.12	4.11	4.15	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	121/1489	4.60	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	682/1506	4.59	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	424/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	131/1438	4.84	4.55	4.46	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	537/1421	4.78	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	429/1411	4.68	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	228/1405	4.74	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	193/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	496/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	749/1255	4.37	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	818/1258	4.57	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	8	9	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 873	4.43	4.00	4.03	4.08	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 4	Under-grad 21	Non-major 7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 393 3  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Rosen, Theodore  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1291  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	598/1509	4.70	4.38	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	731/1509	4.55	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	2	4	4.00	924/1287	4.55	4.27	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	647/1459	4.54	4.28	4.22	4.26	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	253/1406	4.58	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	978/1384	4.32	4.12	4.11	4.15	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	630/1489	4.60	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	642/1506	4.59	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	628/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	4.84	4.55	4.46	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1060/1421	4.78	4.80	4.73	4.73	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	169/1411	4.68	4.45	4.31	4.29	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	345/1405	4.74	4.47	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	489/1236	4.47	4.22	4.00	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	558/1260	4.35	4.25	4.14	4.22	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	904/1255	4.37	4.44	4.33	4.37	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	507/1258	4.57	4.42	4.38	4.42	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	209/ 873	4.43	4.00	4.03	4.08	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 405 1  
 Title Hist & Systems Of Psyc  
 Instructor: Bediako, Shawn M  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1292  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	210/1509	4.85	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	605/1509	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.27	4.30	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	72/1406	4.92	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	385/1384	4.46	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	1	8	4.15	865/1489	4.15	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	3	7	1	3.54	1483/1506	3.54	4.75	4.67	4.67	3.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	301/1463	4.54	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	265/1260	4.73	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1255	4.73	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.91	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	139/ 873	4.70	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.70
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 406 1  
 Title Adv Behavior Pathology  
 Instructor: Murphy,Christop  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1293  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	13	4.56	472/1287	4.56	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	726/1459	4.29	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	261/1406	4.61	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	5	7	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	55/1489	4.94	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	981/1506	4.61	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.61
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	322/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1411	4.78	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	526/1405	4.61	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	223/1236	4.59	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	487/1260	4.43	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	723/1255	4.33	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1258	4.17	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 19	Non-major 4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 407 1  
 Title Adv Child Psychology  
 Instructor: Goldstein,Robin  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1294  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	13	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	183/1287	4.83	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	182/1459	4.76	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	164/1406	4.75	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	199/1384	4.70	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	682/1506	4.85	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	603/1438	4.65	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	285/1405	4.80	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	920/1236	3.64	4.22	4.00	4.03	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	209/1260	4.80	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	333/1255	4.76	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.42	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	235/ 873	4.45	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.45

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 21 Non-major 4
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 409 1  
 Title Development And Educat  
 Instructor: Sonnenschein,Su  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1295  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	987/1509	4.15	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1034/1509	4.08	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	658/1287	4.38	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	924/1459	4.08	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	462/1406	4.38	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	767/1384	4.08	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	5	3.92	1082/1489	3.92	4.30	4.17	4.18	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1273/1506	4.23	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	0	3.90	983/1463	3.90	4.16	4.09	4.18	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	1032/1438	4.31	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	979/1421	4.69	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	964/1411	4.15	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	526/1405	4.62	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	3	5	2	3.64	920/1236	3.64	4.22	4.00	4.03	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	364/1260	4.58	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	344/1255	4.75	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	421/1258	4.75	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	762/ 873	3.30	4.00	4.03	4.26	3.30

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: PSYC 437 1  
 Title Making A Difference  
 Instructor: Maton, Kenneth  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1296  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	235/1509	4.81	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	652/1509	4.44	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	4.75	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	346/1459	4.60	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	130/1406	4.81	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.81
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	103/1384	4.81	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	944/1489	4.06	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	467/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	262/1438	4.88	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	376/1421	4.94	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	169/1411	4.88	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	345/1405	4.75	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	352/1260	4.60	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	367/1255	4.73	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	363/1258	4.80	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	33/ 89	4.87	4.83	4.49	4.71	4.87
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	29/ 92	4.87	4.63	4.54	4.83	4.87
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	18/ 90	4.93	4.77	4.50	4.69	4.93
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	10/ 92	4.93	4.87	4.38	4.64	4.93
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	35/ 93	4.47	4.03	4.06	4.32	4.47

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 440 1  
 Title Seminar In Social Psyc  
 Instructor: Blass,Thomas  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1297  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	563/1509	4.54	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	720/1509	4.38	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	81/1406	4.92	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	6	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	583/1489	4.42	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	511/1463	4.36	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	950/1438	4.38	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	665/1411	4.46	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	333/1405	4.77	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	121/1236	4.77	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	169/ 873	4.63	4.00	4.03	4.26	4.63

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 463 1  
 Title Eating: Normal/Abnorma  
 Instructor: Warwick forsyth  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1298  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	10	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	447/1509	4.58	4.30	4.26	4.26	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.27	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.28	4.22	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	434/1406	4.42	4.23	4.09	4.11	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.12	4.11	4.23	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.30	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1006/1506	4.58	4.75	4.67	4.67	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	804/1463	4.09	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.55	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.80	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.35	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	607/1236	4.11	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	681/1260	4.17	4.25	4.14	4.25	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	839/1255	4.17	4.44	4.33	4.46	4.17
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.42	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.26	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 12	Non-major 2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	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 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 601 1  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Baker,Linda  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1299  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	842/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	2	3.88	1176/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	708/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	1044/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	8	5	3.94	885/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	886/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1295/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	4	9	1	3.67	1168/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	712/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	665/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	351/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	967/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	752/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	558/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	443/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	363/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	705/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 14	Required for Majors 17	Graduate 12	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 5	Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 601 2  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Waldstein,Shari  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1300  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	778/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	11	2	3.88	1176/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	708/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	11	3	4.00	979/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	813/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	10	3	3.94	886/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1295/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	742/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	3	4.13	762/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	904/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	828/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	267/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	634/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	752/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	613/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	443/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	286/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	1	0	4	5	2	3.58	677/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
-----											
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 601 3  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Borrero,John C  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1301  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	8	4.80	244/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1013/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	882/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	454/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	135/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	349/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	597/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	583/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	325/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	675/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	537/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	496/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	540/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	322/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	352/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	4.40	665/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	901/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.10
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	771/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.25

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 4  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Lasson, Elliot D  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1302  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	1	5	3	3.90	1214/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	838/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	678/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	346/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	527/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	5	4.00	807/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	458/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	750/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1166/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	810/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	1141/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	3.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	1197/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	746/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	629/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	620/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	801/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 5  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: DeVries, A E  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1303  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank							
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	911/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	7	4.33	774/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	803/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	803/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	729/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	313/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	541/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	820/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	438/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	413/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	588/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	279/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	587/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	242/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	337/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	344/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	421/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	333/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	4.68	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	4.60	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	4.26	****



Course-Section: PSYC 601 5  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: DeVries, A E  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1303  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 601 6  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Griffith,James  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1304  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	3	1	3.08	1471/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	6	0	3.33	1419/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1186/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	3.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1254/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	1	3	2	3.00	1333/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	4	2	3.42	1230/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	3.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	3	4	1	3.08	1399/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	5	2	0	2.80	1423/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	3	5	0	2.92	1416/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	2.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	1099/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	1	6	0	2.83	1383/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	0	4	1	2.67	1381/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	2.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	3	0	3	2	3.00	1131/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1011/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	505/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	801/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 5	Major 11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 7	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 601 7  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Glasgow,Michael  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1305  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	800/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1306/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1247/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	979/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	813/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1236/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	1	0	3.20	1354/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	800/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	716/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1051/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	634/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601 9  
 Title Special Topics In Psyc  
 Instructor: Milatzo,John P  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1306  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	516/1509	4.19	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	828/1509	3.97	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	708/1287	4.01	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	227/1459	4.20	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	287/1406	4.09	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	182/1384	4.15	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	986/1489	3.89	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	896/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	438/1463	3.91	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1047/1438	4.27	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	4.86	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	713/1411	4.31	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	974/1405	4.13	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	664/1236	3.92	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	4.69	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	4.73	4.42	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	3.61	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 605 1  
 Title Learning And Cognition  
 Instructor: Sigurdsson,Sigu  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1307  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	0	1	7	4.56	540/1509	4.56	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	322/1509	4.70	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	426/1287	4.60	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	911/1459	4.10	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	200/1406	4.70	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	658/1463	4.22	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.55	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	172/1405	4.90	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	176/1236	4.67	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	666/1260	4.20	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	505/1255	4.60	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	549/1258	4.60	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	350/ 873	4.22	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	4.23	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	4.69	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	4.62	4.48	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 606 1  
 Title Adult Psychopathology  
 Instructor: Murphy,Christop  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1308  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	1114/1509	4.00	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	952/1509	4.17	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	359/1287	4.67	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	683/1406	4.17	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	674/1489	4.33	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1162/1421	4.50	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	505/1260	4.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.80	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	549/1258	4.60	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 611 1  
 Title Data Analytic Proc I  
 Instructor: Pitts, Steven C  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1309  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	201/1509	4.86	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	158/1509	4.86	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	167/1287	4.86	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.28	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	971/1406	3.86	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	376/1489	4.57	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	896/1506	4.71	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	291/1438	4.86	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1166/1411	3.86	4.45	4.31	4.33	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1154/1405	3.86	4.47	4.32	4.33	3.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	664/1236	4.00	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1246/1260	2.40	4.25	4.14	4.21	2.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	3	1	0	1	2.80	1230/1255	2.80	4.44	4.33	4.43	2.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	0	1	1	0	2.00	1255/1258	2.00	4.42	4.38	4.50	2.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	73/ 184	4.33	4.23	4.16	4.07	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/ 198	4.83	4.69	4.22	4.31	4.83
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	36/ 184	4.83	4.62	4.48	4.11	4.83
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	65/ 177	4.67	4.68	4.36	4.41	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 165	5.00	4.60	4.18	4.25	5.00
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 611L 1  
 Title Data Analytic Proc. I  
 Instructor: Pitts, Steven C  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1310  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	516/1509	4.57	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	300/1509	4.71	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.27	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	131/1459	4.83	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	224/1489	4.71	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	828/1405	4.33	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	90/1236	4.83	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	982/1260	3.67	4.25	4.14	4.21	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1255	4.25	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1184/1258	3.33	4.42	4.38	4.50	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.01	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	44/ 184	4.60	4.23	4.16	4.07	4.60
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 198	4.80	4.69	4.22	4.31	4.80
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	150/ 184	4.20	4.62	4.48	4.11	4.20
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.68	4.36	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	25/ 165	4.80	4.60	4.18	4.25	4.80

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PSYC 615 1  
 Title Meth Appl Behav An  
 Instructor: Deleon,Iser G  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1311  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	648/1509	4.46	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	605/1509	4.46	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	491/1287	4.54	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	686/1459	4.33	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	313/1406	4.54	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	492/1384	4.36	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.36
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	330/1489	4.62	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	430/1438	4.77	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	482/1411	4.62	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	526/1405	4.62	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	489/1236	4.25	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	1	9	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	904/1255	4.00	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	710/1258	4.42	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	738/ 873	3.40	4.00	4.03	4.01	3.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 620 1  
 Title Methods Of Assessment  
 Instructor: Schiffman,Jason  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1312  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	4	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1406	4.83	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	619/1384	4.25	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	467/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	800/1438	4.50	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	211/1411	4.83	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	536/1236	4.20	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1260	4.83	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	324/1258	4.83	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	292/ 873	4.33	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 623 1  
 Title Clinical Interventn II  
 Instructor: Diclemente, Carl  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1313  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	800/1509	4.33	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1306/1509	3.67	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	0	2	0	2.25	1285/1287	2.25	4.27	4.30	4.22	2.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	3	0	3.11	1409/1459	3.11	4.28	4.22	4.16	3.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	623/1406	4.22	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	0	2	3.11	1311/1384	3.11	4.12	4.11	4.16	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	2.78	1436/1489	2.78	4.30	4.17	4.14	2.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	556/1411	4.56	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	708/1405	4.44	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	489/1236	4.25	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	230/1260	4.78	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	261/1258	4.89	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	317/ 873	4.29	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.29

Frequency Distribution

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

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	8	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.38	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	992/1509	4.13	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	****	4.27	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	324/1459	4.63	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.23	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	589/1384	4.29	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	728/1489	4.29	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1146/1506	4.43	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	500/1463	4.38	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	904/1438	4.43	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	190/1411	4.86	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	824/1236	3.80	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.25	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.86	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	130/ 873	4.71	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.71
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.63	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.77	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.03	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.03	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 651 1  
 Title Cognitive Development  
 Instructor: Sonnenschein,Su  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1315  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	244/1509	4.80	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	346/1459	4.60	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.23	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	823/1489	4.20	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	467/1463	4.40	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.55	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1405	4.60	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	936/1236	3.60	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.25	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.44	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	850/1258	4.20	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	4.75	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 655 1  
 Title Adv Top A Behav An  
 Instructor: Kahng,Sungwoo  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1316  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	9	4.82	235/1509	4.82	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	192/1509	4.82	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1287	****	4.27	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	410/1459	4.55	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	130/1406	4.82	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	320/1384	4.55	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	145/1489	4.82	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	286/1463	4.56	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1288/1438	3.83	4.55	4.46	4.49	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	810/1411	4.33	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/1236	****	4.22	4.00	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	136/1260	4.90	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	205/1255	4.90	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.42	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	261/ 873	4.40	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.40

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 670 1  
 Title I/O Psychology  
 Instructor: Rosen, Theodore  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1317  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	11	3	3.60	1369/1509	3.60	4.38	4.31	4.39	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	6	8	3.90	1164/1509	3.90	4.30	4.26	4.25	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	739/1287	4.30	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	5	8	3.94	885/1406	3.94	4.23	4.09	4.12	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	9	5	3.95	886/1384	3.95	4.12	4.11	4.16	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	4	8	3.94	1058/1489	3.94	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	702/1506	4.84	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.84
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	6	7	2	3.73	1117/1463	3.73	4.16	4.09	4.15	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	4	9	3.95	1235/1438	3.95	4.55	4.46	4.49	3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	665/1421	4.85	4.80	4.73	4.78	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	3	12	4.20	936/1411	4.20	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	3	10	3.80	1177/1405	3.80	4.47	4.32	4.33	3.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	2	3	8	5	3.89	784/1236	3.89	4.22	4.00	3.98	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1260	****	4.25	4.14	4.21	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1255	****	4.44	4.33	4.43	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1258	****	4.42	4.38	4.50	****
4. Were special techniques successful	17	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 873	****	4.00	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A 12	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 17	Major 19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 3	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	17	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 695 1  
 Title Sem In Human Serv Psyc  
 Instructor: Diclemente, Carl  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1318  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	446/1509	4.78	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	1020/1509	4.43	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	519/1287	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	553/1459	4.65	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	246/1406	4.36	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	570/1384	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1219/1489	4.31	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	118/1463	4.81	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1438	4.70	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	456/1411	4.70	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	419/1405	4.81	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	536/1236	4.31	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	201/1260	4.21	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	205/1255	4.85	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	236/1258	4.95	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	209/ 873	4.50	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: PSYC 695 2  
 Title Sem In Human Serv Psyc  
 Instructor: Stapleton,Laura  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1319  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1509	4.78	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	245/1509	4.43	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	114/1287	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	126/1459	4.65	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	5	4.08	753/1406	4.36	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	96/1384	4.57	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	73/1489	4.31	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	832/1506	4.88	4.75	4.67	4.71	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	114/1463	4.81	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	430/1438	4.70	4.55	4.46	4.49	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	291/1411	4.70	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	137/1405	4.81	4.47	4.32	4.33	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	346/1236	4.31	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1011/1260	4.21	4.25	4.14	4.21	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	287/1255	4.85	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1258	4.95	4.42	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 873	4.50	4.00	4.03	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	4.83	4.49	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 742 1  
 Title Sem Child Health Psyc  
 Instructor: Dahlquist,Lynnnd  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 1320  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	7	4.78	279/1509	4.78	4.38	4.31	4.39	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	4.27	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	99/1406	4.89	4.23	4.09	4.12	4.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.12	4.11	4.16	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	541/1489	4.44	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.75	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.25	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.55	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.80	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1411	4.89	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.47	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	512/1236	4.22	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	150/1260	4.89	4.25	4.14	4.21	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	221/1255	4.89	4.44	4.33	4.43	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	398/1258	4.78	4.42	4.38	4.50	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	405/ 873	4.13	4.00	4.03	4.01	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 89	4.80	4.83	4.49	4.39	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	63/ 92	4.40	4.63	4.54	4.52	4.40
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	50/ 90	4.60	4.77	4.50	4.48	4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	19/ 92	4.80	4.87	4.38	4.30	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	71/ 93	3.60	4.03	4.06	4.04	3.60

Frequency Distribution

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