

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J
 Enrollment: 197
 Questionnaires: 107

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1303
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	1	14	28	61	4.43	742/1576	4.29	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	8	24	70	4.55	555/1576	4.31	4.19	4.27	4.18	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	4	6	22	70	4.55	541/1342	4.26	4.17	4.32	4.19	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	23	0	6	11	19	44	4.26	848/1520	4.04	4.17	4.25	4.09	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	4	5	4	27	61	4.35	562/1465	4.28	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	41	2	1	11	16	31	4.20	748/1434	4.01	4.09	4.14	3.94	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	5	10	28	59	4.32	774/1547	4.09	4.18	4.19	4.10	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	2	1	26	72	4.66	911/1574	4.52	4.67	4.64	4.59	4.66	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	24	1	0	0	8	35	39	4.38	571/1554	4.07	4.01	4.10	4.01	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	4	18	76	4.71	610/1488	4.61	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	2	15	83	4.78	849/1493	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.65	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	6	19	74	4.69	437/1486	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.26	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	6	6	18	68	4.41	813/1489	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.22	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	3	1	10	24	57	4.38	429/1277	4.35	4.03	4.03	3.91	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	68	0	5	1	6	9	18	3.87	910/1279	3.82	4.08	4.17	3.96	3.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	68	0	0	1	6	7	25	4.44	706/1270	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.09	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	68	0	1	0	4	4	30	4.59	596/1269	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.09	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	68	16	3	2	3	2	13	3.87	****/ 878	4.15	3.86	4.05	3.91	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	105	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	105	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	105	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	105	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	105	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	106	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	106	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	106	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	105	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	105	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	105	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	105	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	105	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J
 Enrollment: 197
 Questionnaires: 107

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1303
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	29	0.00-0.99	2	A	47	Required for Majors	44	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	1	B	37						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	16	C	9	General	14	Under-grad	107	Non-major	100
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	19	F	0	Electives	6	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 198
 Questionnaires: 115

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1304
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	3	5	19	31	55	4.15	1050/1576	4.29	4.24	4.30	4.11	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	7	23	30	51	4.07	1094/1576	4.31	4.19	4.27	4.18	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	6	6	22	29	49	3.97	1000/1342	4.26	4.17	4.32	4.19	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	31	2	10	20	19	31	3.82	1225/1520	4.04	4.17	4.25	4.09	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	2	4	18	29	55	4.21	688/1465	4.28	4.08	4.12	4.02	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	59	2	7	13	9	23	3.81	1057/1434	4.01	4.09	4.14	3.94	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	7	7	26	28	45	3.86	1182/1547	4.09	4.18	4.19	4.10	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	1	1	64	45	4.38	1227/1574	4.52	4.67	4.64	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	1	1	6	26	45	18	3.76	1159/1554	4.07	4.01	4.10	4.01	3.76	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	13	15	80	4.52	858/1488	4.61	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	13	27	69	4.47	1240/1493	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.65	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	4	11	32	61	4.30	929/1486	4.49	4.28	4.32	4.26	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	6	10	13	24	57	4.05	1091/1489	4.23	4.26	4.32	4.22	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	2	3	5	12	21	64	4.31	480/1277	4.35	4.03	4.03	3.91	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	64	0	4	0	18	11	18	3.76	957/1279	3.82	4.08	4.17	3.96	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	63	0	1	2	14	10	25	4.08	910/1270	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.09	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	64	0	2	1	13	7	28	4.14	888/1269	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.09	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	64	12	1	2	5	13	18	4.15	420/ 878	4.15	3.86	4.05	3.91	4.15	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	108	0	1	0	1	3	2	3.71	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	108	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	108	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	109	2	1	0	1	2	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	108	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	109	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	109	2	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	110	2	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	110	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	110	2	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	111	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	110	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	110	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	110	1	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	111	1	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	111	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	112	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	111	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	112	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	112	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 198
 Questionnaires: 115

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1304
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	23	0.00-0.99	0	A	37	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	1	Major	4
28-55	12	1.00-1.99	0	B	45						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	10	C	8	General	15	Under-grad	114	Non-major	111
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0101
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1305
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	0	2	13	39	4.69	387/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	1	0	4	12	37	4.56	542/1576	4.39	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	5	16	32	4.46	633/1342	4.25	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	11	0	1	4	13	24	4.43	648/1520	4.12	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	5	8	38	4.53	353/1465	4.37	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	8	2	2	7	12	23	4.13	806/1434	3.73	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	1	4	9	40	4.63	387/1547	4.52	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	1	0	10	43	4.76	758/1574	4.77	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	1	1	1	1	15	24	4.43	504/1554	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	3	15	34	4.55	822/1488	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	1	0	6	45	4.83	759/1493	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	2	1	16	33	4.54	642/1486	4.52	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	3	11	36	4.52	684/1489	4.43	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.52	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	4	15	34	4.57	278/1277	4.47	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	3	3	24	4.70	312/1279	4.32	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	30	0	0	0	2	1	27	4.83	326/1270	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	278/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	3	0	2	1	10	14	4.33	322/ 878	4.28	3.86	4.05	3.92	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.65	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	59	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	23	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	9	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	60	Non-major	46
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	1			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	24	
?	0			

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0201
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 91
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1306
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	13	29	4.46	712/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	13	29	4.51	594/1576	4.39	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	17	26	4.43	683/1342	4.25	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	3	9	10	14	3.89	1172/1520	4.12	4.17	4.25	4.26	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	7	37	4.65	277/1465	4.37	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	4	4	6	10	9	3.48	1215/1434	3.73	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.48	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	13	32	4.58	434/1547	4.52	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	15	30	4.55	1041/1574	4.77	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.55	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	1	3	17	18	4.33	623/1554	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	3	43	4.83	355/1488	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	42	4.85	683/1493	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	12	34	4.67	468/1486	4.52	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	12	32	4.54	649/1489	4.43	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	5	9	32	4.46	356/1277	4.47	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	582/1279	4.32	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	26	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	636/1270	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	26	0	0	0	3	3	16	4.59	590/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	26	4	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	383/ 878	4.28	3.86	4.05	3.92	4.22	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	47	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	47	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	9	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	18						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	48	Non-major	29
84-150	3	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	21				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0301
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1307
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	19	0	0	3	6	8	23	4.28	928/1576	4.47	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	19	0	0	2	6	18	14	4.10	1076/1576	4.39	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	19	0	2	2	11	10	15	3.85	1089/1342	4.25	4.17	4.32	4.41	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	20	2	2	2	7	8	18	4.03	1031/1520	4.12	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	19	1	1	5	7	9	17	3.92	961/1465	4.37	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	19	2	4	4	5	16	9	3.58	1181/1434	3.73	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	19	0	0	3	4	9	24	4.35	737/1547	4.52	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	20	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1574	4.77	4.67	4.64	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	25	1	1	3	7	13	9	3.79	1145/1554	4.18	4.01	4.10	4.05	3.79	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	19	0	0	1	4	12	23	4.43	970/1488	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	2	4	34	4.80	810/1493	4.83	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	19	0	0	3	3	11	23	4.35	871/1486	4.52	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	3	5	12	20	4.22	976/1489	4.43	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	20	0	2	2	1	8	26	4.38	421/1277	4.47	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	2	6	7	13	3.90	899/1279	4.32	4.08	4.17	4.14	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	2	5	4	19	4.33	784/1270	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	1	4	5	20	4.47	677/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	17	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	****/ 878	4.28	3.86	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	57	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.38	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	55	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.74	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.71	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	57	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.69	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	57	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.64	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	57	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	56	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0301
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1307
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	8	C	11	General	6	Under-grad	59	Non-major	41
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	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	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: BORRERO, JOHN
 Enrollment: 100
 Questionnaires: 68

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1308
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	19	45	4.59	527/1576	4.45	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	57	4.81	222/1576	4.69	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	56	4.78	275/1342	4.64	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	33	0	0	4	10	21	4.49	545/1520	4.50	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.49	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	9	3	11	14	28	3.75	1102/1465	3.86	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	49	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	****/1434	4.31	4.09	4.14	4.06	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	0	6	59	4.91	123/1547	4.86	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	62	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	2	0	0	11	44	4.67	263/1554	4.37	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	60	4.91	248/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	64	4.97	223/1493	4.96	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	12	51	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	10	55	4.85	263/1489	4.85	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	8	56	4.82	129/1277	4.73	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	4	8	19	4.48	466/1279	4.44	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	0	0	4	0	27	4.74	424/1270	4.61	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	575/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	37	16	3	1	1	3	7	3.67	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	3.92	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	66	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	67	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	65	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	67	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	66	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	31	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	37
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	68	Non-major	31
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	47				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0201
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S
 Enrollment: 99
 Questionnaires: 54

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1309
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	7	22	24	4.32	871/1576	4.45	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.32	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	16	34	4.57	528/1576	4.69	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	6	10	36	4.51	583/1342	4.64	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.51	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	499/1520	4.50	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.52	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	5	7	13	24	3.96	905/1465	3.86	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	36	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	614/1434	4.31	4.09	4.14	4.06	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	44	4.81	179/1547	4.86	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	50	4.94	281/1574	4.94	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	5	26	13	4.07	892/1554	4.37	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	52	5.00	1/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.44	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	49	4.94	334/1493	4.96	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	9	40	4.75	352/1486	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	45	4.85	263/1489	4.85	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	3	11	34	4.65	229/1277	4.73	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	2	0	0	7	16	4.40	554/1279	4.44	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	0	0	2	9	14	4.48	656/1270	4.61	4.33	4.35	4.30	4.48	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	527/1269	4.65	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	29	19	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	3.92	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors	6
28-55	11	1.00-1.99 0	B 24		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 7	C 3	General	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 10	D 1		Under-grad 54
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	36
			? 2		

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ARNHEIM, DANIEL
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1310
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	14	10	20	3.94	1213/1576	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	12	17	17	4.00	1138/1576	4.21	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	12	28	4.35	753/1342	4.33	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.35	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	2	3	6	4	24	4.15	953/1520	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	4	6	32	4.41	498/1465	4.16	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	4	12	3	21	3.69	1132/1434	3.82	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	6	12	23	4.09	985/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	9	0	0	10	28	4.74	795/1574	4.86	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.74		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	5	1	0	9	14	4	3.71	1194/1554	4.02	4.01	4.10	4.05	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	11	9	23	4.18	1165/1488	4.52	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	4	6	8	27	4.29	1344/1493	4.60	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	9	14	20	4.16	1032/1486	4.36	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	7	1	1	5	11	20	4.26	948/1489	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	3	4	13	22	4.14	630/1277	4.36	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	8	4	6	9	6	3.03	1182/1279	3.80	4.08	4.17	4.14	3.03	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	7	5	9	3	9	3.06	1203/1270	3.60	4.33	4.35	4.30	3.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	5	7	6	7	8	3.18	1191/1269	3.83	4.33	4.35	4.29	3.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	23	3	0	3	1	3	3.10	****/ 878	3.07	3.86	4.05	3.92	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.47	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.78	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.72	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 24	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 13			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 48	Non-major 42
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 28		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0201
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1311
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	1	7	13	11	4.06	1112/1576	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	8	11	12	4.06	1100/1576	4.21	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	4	6	6	16	3.97	1010/1342	4.33	4.17	4.32	4.41	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	0	8	9	15	4.12	977/1520	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	1	1	3	4	12	12	3.97	905/1465	4.16	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	2	4	5	8	13	3.81	1057/1434	3.82	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	4	13	16	4.36	727/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	527/1574	4.86	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	10	13	4	3.78	1152/1554	4.02	4.01	4.10	4.05	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	666/1488	4.52	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	8	23	4.64	1089/1493	4.60	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	5	9	19	4.42	792/1486	4.36	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	9	7	17	4.24	962/1489	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.24	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	0	0	3	4	8	15	4.17	608/1277	4.36	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	4	7	10	4.00	802/1279	3.80	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	2	5	4	11	3.96	967/1270	3.60	4.33	4.35	4.30	3.96	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	6	13	4.30	793/1269	3.83	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	9	3	1	6	0	4	3.07	795/ 878	3.07	3.86	4.05	3.92	3.07	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	8	Under-grad	38	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0301
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1312
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	2	0	4	5	27	4.45	727/1576	4.15	4.24	4.30	4.35	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	3	7	26	4.57	528/1576	4.21	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	1	0	2	4	29	4.67	406/1342	4.33	4.17	4.32	4.41	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	5	1	3	4	3	20	4.23	891/1520	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.26	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	1	2	2	4	10	17	4.09	808/1465	4.16	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	3	2	1	8	7	15	3.97	928/1434	3.82	4.09	4.14	4.06	3.97	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	5	3	28	4.64	375/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.22	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	141/1574	4.86	4.67	4.64	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	0	10	21	4.56	347/1554	4.02	4.01	4.10	4.05	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	2	3	29	4.71	589/1488	4.52	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	1	3	32	4.86	658/1493	4.60	4.67	4.73	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	1	5	4	25	4.51	666/1486	4.36	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	3	29	4.64	539/1489	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.31	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	2	0	2	30	4.76	154/1277	4.36	4.03	4.03	4.01	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	2	1	10	4.36	589/1279	3.80	4.08	4.17	4.14	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	29	0	3	0	2	1	8	3.79	1041/1270	3.60	4.33	4.35	4.30	3.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	29	0	2	1	1	1	9	4.00	928/1269	3.83	4.33	4.35	4.29	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	6	2	0	1	2	2	3.29	****/ 878	3.07	3.86	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 8	C 2	General 9	Under-grad 43 Non-major 42
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 305 0101
 Title THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 91
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1313
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	1	1	3	13	25	4.40	797/1576	4.40	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	1	17	24	4.47	668/1576	4.47	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	0	4	11	26	4.37	735/1342	4.37	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.37	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	20	2	1	2	4	14	4.17	937/1520	4.17	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	1	2	2	13	24	4.36	554/1465	4.36	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	27	3	0	0	2	11	4.13	816/1434	4.13	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	1	2	3	36	4.67	327/1547	4.67	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	21	21	4.47	1128/1574	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	1	7	12	13	4.12	849/1554	4.12	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	6	34	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	1	0	1	4	35	4.76	908/1493	4.76	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	3	7	29	4.51	666/1486	4.51	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	0	3	8	28	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	2	0	3	8	27	4.45	366/1277	4.45	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	3	2	4	3	8	3.55	1043/1279	3.55	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	3	1	3	3	10	3.80	1033/1270	3.80	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	3	2	5	9	3.90	992/1269	3.90	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	13	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	44	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 16			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C 5	General 13	Under-grad 47	Non-major 29
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 306 0101
 Title LIFESPAN HUMAN DEVELOP
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 106
 Questionnaires: 65

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1314
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	3	5	19	35	4.39	808/1576	4.39	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	3	6	17	36	4.39	785/1576	4.39	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	3	7	13	38	4.35	753/1342	4.35	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	37	1	2	4	6	11	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	2	16	39	4.46	439/1465	4.46	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	47	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	****/1434	****	4.09	4.14	4.15	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	0	6	19	34	4.42	673/1547	4.42	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	32	27	4.46	1140/1574	4.46	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	0	10	24	16	4.06	897/1554	4.06	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	5	15	40	4.47	920/1488	4.47	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	9	51	4.77	868/1493	4.77	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	3	16	40	4.48	706/1486	4.48	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	5	12	40	4.41	813/1489	4.41	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	2	0	6	14	37	4.42	385/1277	4.42	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	37	0	4	1	10	3	10	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	37	0	1	3	12	2	10	3.61	1116/1270	3.61	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.61
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	2	3	7	3	13	3.79	1025/1269	3.79	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.79
4. Were special techniques successful	38	18	4	0	1	2	2	2.78	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 1	B 27		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 7	C 11	General 14	Under-grad 65 Non-major 55
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 9	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 35	
			? 2		

Course-Section: PSYC 307 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 100
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1315
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	18	36	4.49	652/1576	4.49	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.49	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	13	36	4.37	798/1576	4.37	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	6	10	40	4.46	646/1342	4.46	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	21	3	1	6	7	21	4.11	994/1520	4.11	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	5	15	31	4.19	708/1465	4.19	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	38	3	2	2	2	11	3.80	1063/1434	3.80	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	12	40	4.53	492/1547	4.53	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	1	0	43	13	4.19	1367/1574	4.19	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	1	0	1	2	27	16	4.26	702/1554	4.26	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	0	12	41	4.56	798/1488	4.56	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	53	4.91	501/1493	4.91	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	11	40	4.54	631/1486	4.54	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	16	40	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	1	5	12	36	4.54	293/1277	4.54	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	3	7	3	20	4.21	697/1279	4.21	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	3	1	8	5	16	3.91	1006/1270	3.91	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	1	0	8	6	18	4.21	840/1269	4.21	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	15	4	1	3	1	9	3.56	698/ 878	3.56	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	56	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	56	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	56	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	57	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	57	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	58	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 307 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 100
 Questionnaires: 60

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1315
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	10	General	17	Under-grad	60	Non-major	29
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 308 8620
 Title CHILD MALTREATMENT
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1316
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	4	22	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	434/1576	4.63	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	20	4.53	476/1520	4.53	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	23	4.70	244/1465	4.70	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	24	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	22	4.63	375/1547	4.63	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	463/1554	4.46	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	22	4.60	750/1488	4.60	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	660/1489	4.53	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	4	7	12	4.16	608/1277	4.16	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.16	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	3	22	4.62	365/1279	4.62	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	541/1270	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.62	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	288/1269	4.90	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	2	8	13	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 1 Major 24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 30 Non-major 7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 317 0101
 Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1317
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	1124/1576	4.05	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	10	4.05	1113/1576	4.05	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	7	9	3.95	1020/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	9	4.05	1022/1520	4.05	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.05	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	4	10	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	5	5	6	3.63	1157/1434	3.63	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	4	8	5	3.45	1363/1547	3.45	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	15	4.64	957/1574	4.64	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	6	6	1	3.25	1390/1554	3.25	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	4	13	4.33	1321/1493	4.33	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	3	3	11	4.05	1085/1486	4.05	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.05	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	4	11	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	3	5	9	3.81	856/1277	3.81	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.81	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	2	1	6	3.91	899/1279	3.91	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	763/1270	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	1	1	7	4.18	858/1269	4.18	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	7	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 7	General 3	Under-grad 21 Non-major 14
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 13	
			? 2		

Course-Section: PSYC 320 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1318
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	10	9	15	4.03	1136/1576	4.03	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.03	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	13	11	11	3.89	1248/1576	3.89	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	13	13	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	9	9	16	4.11	985/1520	4.11	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	4	6	6	18	4.03	839/1465	4.03	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	8	9	12	3.79	1069/1434	3.79	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	2	9	10	11	3.69	1267/1547	3.69	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	23	9	4.17	1379/1574	4.17	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	7	9	12	4.10	871/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	10	11	14	4.11	1197/1488	4.11	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	4	27	4.71	1006/1493	4.71	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	9	11	13	4.03	1094/1486	4.03	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.03	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	9	7	17	4.18	1012/1489	4.18	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	15	5	1	3	2	8	3.37	1077/1277	3.37	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	2	4	5	10	4.10	774/1279	4.10	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	4	2	14	4.38	749/1270	4.38	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	632/1269	4.52	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.67	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 23	Required for Majors	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 330 0101
 Title CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1319
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	312/1576	4.74	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	489/1576	4.59	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	19	4.56	531/1342	4.56	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	4	19	4.62	385/1520	4.62	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	7	15	4.35	562/1465	4.35	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	7	17	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	15	10	4.40	1202/1574	4.40	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	10	12	4.48	436/1554	4.48	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	99/1488	4.96	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	445/1493	4.92	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	231/1486	4.85	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	309/1489	4.81	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.81	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	154/1277	4.76	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	435/1270	4.73	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	660/ 878	3.70	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.70	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 88
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1320
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	2	11	22	4.47	682/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	27	4.68	378/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	3	29	4.69	369/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	4	8	22	4.53	487/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	2	13	17	4.29	606/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	0	6	9	16	4.32	604/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	1	3	29	4.76	228/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	35	4.94	281/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	208/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	463/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	810/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	484/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	26	4.76	378/1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	8	1	0	2	2	18	4.57	278/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	1	0	4	11	4.35	589/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	620/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	375/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	4	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	322/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	****/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	****/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	****/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	****/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	4	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 88
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1320
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	38	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: TALWAR, GITIKA
 Enrollment: 88
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1321
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1148/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1138/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	583/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	511/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1067/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	238/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	712/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	1155/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1125/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1118/1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1020/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	554/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	464/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: SEMIATIN, JOSH
 Enrollment: 88
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1322
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	457/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	434/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	552/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	579/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	347/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	5	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	498/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	3	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	503/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	866/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	307/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	736/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	868/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	251/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	420/1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	9	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	1020/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	4	12	4.32	617/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	666/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	519/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	648/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.73	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Major
			P 0		Non-major 7
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Electives	0
				Other	15
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1323
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	6	6	4	3.88	1266/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	448/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	0	14	4.75	298/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	511/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	1	2	4	0	4	3.36	1306/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	748/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	387/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	758/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	783/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	638/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	784/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	851/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	552/1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	802/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	802/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	908/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	3	1	0	6	3.64	1076/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	24/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.83	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	69/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	54/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1323
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1324
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	2	2	3	3.08	1530/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	3	1	1	2	2.33	1572/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	2.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	4	0	2	1	2.27	1340/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	2.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	0	2	3	0	2.86	1491/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	2.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	2	2	2	2.75	1431/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	2	1	3	1	3.13	1353/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	2	5	1	3.00	1459/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	4	2	2	1	0	2.00	1549/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	2	4	1	2.92	1461/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	2.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	0	5	0	4	3.17	1487/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	3.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	3	3	2	0	2.25	1480/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	2.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	2	2	2	0	2.00	1480/1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	5	0	1	3	1	2.50	1238/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	1	2	1	2.55	1245/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	2.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	3	3	2	2	1	2.55	1247/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	2.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	5	1	1	3	1	2.45	1249/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	2.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	770/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	117/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.33	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	221/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	132/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	11

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: METZGER, SHARI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1325
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	712/1576	4.09	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	215/1576	4.18	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	819/1342	4.17	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	683/1520	4.21	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	335/1465	3.88	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	193/1434	4.18	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	527/1547	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	645/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	155/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	995/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	966/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	271/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	420/1489	4.14	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	3.77	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	393/1279	4.03	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	412/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	353/1269	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	135/ 878	4.02	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.78	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	27/ 234	4.66	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	91/ 240	4.28	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	114/ 229	4.70	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.60	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	49/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	55/ 379	4.73	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.83	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 24	4.67	4.67	4.83	4.89	4.67	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.78	5.00	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	5.00	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: METZGER, SHARI
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1325
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1326
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	10	9	12	4.00	1148/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	6	10	13	4.03	1119/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	12	12	4.09	941/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	631/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	6	11	13	4.03	834/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	12	15	4.31	614/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	9	16	4.25	838/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	1140/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	11	11	4	3.67	1227/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	7	7	13	3.90	1316/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	4	5	22	4.58	1142/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	6	5	8	9	3.45	1346/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	9	8	11	3.77	1247/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	8	3	5	6	4	2.81	1203/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	758/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	696/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	780/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	2	4	5	4	3	3.11	792/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	26
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1327
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	10	9	12	4.00	1148/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	6	10	13	4.03	1119/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	12	12	4.09	941/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	631/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	6	11	13	4.03	834/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	12	15	4.31	614/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	9	16	4.25	838/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	1140/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	3	0	1	0	10	3	4.07	886/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	957/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	18	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	1263/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	851/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	4	5	5	3.75	1255/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	19	5	3	0	3	2	2	3.00	1149/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	758/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	696/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	780/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	2	4	5	4	3	3.11	792/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	26

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1328
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	10	9	12	4.00	1148/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	6	10	13	4.03	1119/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	12	12	4.09	941/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	631/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	6	11	13	4.03	834/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	12	15	4.31	614/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	9	16	4.25	838/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	1140/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	2	1	0	5	4	0	3.20	1405/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	23	0	0	1	4	3	3	3.73	1359/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	23	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	1402/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	23	0	1	3	1	4	2	3.27	1384/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	0	1	4	3	3.36	1355/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	2	3	2	2	1	0	2.13	****/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	758/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	696/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	780/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	2	4	5	4	3	3.11	792/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1329
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	10	9	12	4.00	1148/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	3	6	10	13	4.03	1119/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.03	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	7	12	12	4.09	941/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	9	19	4.44	631/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	6	11	13	4.03	834/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.03	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	12	15	4.31	614/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	6	9	16	4.25	838/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	1140/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	22	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	518/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	995/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	24	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1125/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.43	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	24	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	821/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	696/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	24	5	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	758/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	2	7	15	4.44	696/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	4	9	12	4.32	780/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.32	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	6	2	4	5	4	3	3.11	792/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.11	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 14		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	26
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: GERBER, EVIE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1330
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1523/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1294/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1466/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1386/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1380/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1459/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1233/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: GARRETT, ADIA J
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1331
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	9	22	16	4.08	1100/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	7	16	23	4.25	939/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	7	6	18	16	3.85	1089/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	1	7	12	26	4.30	815/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	12	3	14	14	4	2.89	1417/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	18	23	4.32	614/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	1	5	14	24	4.17	916/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	43	4.90	488/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	7	20	11	4.03	913/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.03
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	13	32	4.60	750/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	18	27	4.51	1201/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.51
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	5	18	20	4.13	1054/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	10	16	19	4.09	1075/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	9	2	2	9	7	16	3.92	791/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.92
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	3	1	2	10	12	3.96	840/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	2	2	10	14	4.29	814/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	2	2	8	15	4.33	773/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	22	8	2	1	4	5	7	3.74	642/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.74
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	44	0	1	0	1	3	0	3.20	****/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	45	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	****/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	45	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	45	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	45	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 25		Graduate 0
56-83	16	2.00-2.99 10	C 5	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 14	D 0		Under-grad 49
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	40
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: ELDER, CHARLOTT
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1332
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	1241/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	0	3	6	4.09	1082/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	835/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	837/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	2	2	3	3.56	1225/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	564/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	978/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1074/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1048/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1384/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	2	0	3	3.83	1222/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1283/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	802/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	881/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1005/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	138/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.20	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	122/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.40	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	67/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	90/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.60	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	44/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	4.43	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	4.29	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	4.43	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	4.14	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	4.43	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: ELDER, CHARLOTT
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1332
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	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	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: OZDEMIR, SERGI
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1333
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	1065/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	759/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	8	1	3.91	1068/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	768/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1059/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	5	4.20	748/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	6	2	4	3.40	1380/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	1003/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	3	3	3.82	1124/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	1072/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1337/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.30	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1003/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1065/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	2	1	1	2	0	2.50	1238/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	802/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1019/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	4	2	4.00	928/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	631/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	2	4	0	3.67	201/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3.67	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	226/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	3.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	203/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	165/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	362/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	3.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CAITL
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1334
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	3	7	12	0	3.41	1482/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	9	5	4	3.41	1438/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	2	5	5	3	3.60	1184/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	9	4	3.55	1349/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	3	4	5	2	1	2.60	1444/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	8	6	3.67	1142/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	5	5	1	8	3.38	1384/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	665/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	12	4	0	3.05	1439/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	2	6	5	1	3.20	1433/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	3	5	4	2	3.36	1481/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	3.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	3	3	6	1	1	2.57	1467/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	2.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	5	4	2	3.13	1403/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	7	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1064/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	892/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1036/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	764/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	3	4	1	3	3.36	220/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3.36	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	224/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	3.55	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	203/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	152/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.18	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	1	1	0	4	4	3.90	325/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	3.90	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 20
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	5	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 16		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1335
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	12	17	9	3.65	1388/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	13	11	17	4.00	1138/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	5	12	12	12	3.69	1157/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	11	15	14	3.93	1128/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	8	6	12	11	5	2.98	1395/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.98	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	6	17	15	3.95	941/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	6	29	4.44	624/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	26	4.60	1003/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	2	13	16	2	3.47	1317/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	7	33	4.65	680/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	6	13	24	4.42	1278/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	15	19	4.21	988/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	6	7	16	12	3.76	1251/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	1	4	17	17	4.12	638/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	7	11	10	9	3.32	1135/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	5	12	9	13	3.63	1103/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	3	4	10	14	10	3.59	1092/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.59	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	16	6	4	3	8	4	3.00	799/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	5	4	8	15	10	3.50	209/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	4	7	15	14	3.90	209/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	3.90	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	1	0	2	7	11	20	4.22	188/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.22	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	2	2	8	11	17	3.97	169/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	3.97	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	1	5	4	15	14	3.92	305/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	3.92	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	40	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	4.43	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	4.29	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	4.43	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	4.14	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	4.43	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1335
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	38
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	20						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	43	Non-major	5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: HAHN, AMY
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1336
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	1106/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	891/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	744/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1041/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1292/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	991/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	527/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	1236/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	518/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1286/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1118/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	649/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	763/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	754/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	464/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	70/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.53	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	69/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	54/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	60/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.73	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	58/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.64	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: MIN, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1337
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1042/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1023/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1110/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1212/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	850/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	878/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	900/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1227/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1022/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1116/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1086/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.60
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	709/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	219/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3.38
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	148/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.25
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	133/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	144/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.25
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	229/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 1	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: SPRUNG, MOLLIE
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1338
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	6	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1445/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1023/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1097/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1212/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1292/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	878/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1239/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	758/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	924/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	445/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	636/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	819/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	464/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	117/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	4.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	109/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.44
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	93/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	115/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	55/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8620
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1339
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	429/1576	3.90	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	9	16	4.58	515/1576	4.04	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	418/1342	3.95	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	11	15	4.58	429/1520	4.10	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	571/1465	3.58	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	375/1434	4.09	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	228/1547	4.05	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	586/1574	4.59	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	10	10	4.32	649/1554	3.79	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	8	16	4.54	834/1488	4.28	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	888/1493	4.36	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	10	10	4.08	1078/1486	3.98	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	10	12	4.15	1027/1489	3.95	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.15	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	309/1277	3.32	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	6	5	7	3.95	860/1279	3.97	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	0	7	10	4.32	798/1270	4.20	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	2	4	11	4.26	814/1269	4.10	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	12	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	764/ 878	3.42	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	4	3	5	6	8	3.42	216/ 234	3.80	4.03	4.23	4.24	3.42	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	7	10	9	4.08	191/ 240	4.10	4.19	4.35	4.32	4.08	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	3	1	2	3	6	11	4.04	200/ 229	4.37	4.44	4.51	4.48	4.04	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	3	3	5	15	4.23	146/ 232	4.30	4.44	4.29	4.16	4.23	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	1	2	3	5	13	4.13	200/ 379	4.19	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.13	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	71/ 85	4.43	4.71	4.72	4.67	4.43	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	64/ 79	4.29	4.54	4.69	4.69	4.29	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	55/ 72	4.43	4.71	4.64	4.53	4.43	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	69/ 80	4.14	4.37	4.61	4.22	4.14	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	161/ 375	4.43	4.61	4.01	4.12	4.43	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8620
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1339
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	25
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 333 0101
 Title LAUGHTER AND HUMOR (SS)
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1340
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	11	9	13	3.84	1299/1576	3.84	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	9	12	10	3.65	1352/1576	3.65	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	3	12	9	10	3.54	1199/1342	3.54	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	3	12	8	6	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	10	20	4.31	596/1465	4.31	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	8	10	11	6	3.30	1303/1434	3.30	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	10	9	15	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	4.70	851/1574	4.70	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	4	14	10	6	3.46	1326/1554	3.46	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	8	12	12	3.83	1334/1488	3.83	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	868/1493	4.78	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	8	12	10	3.82	1225/1486	3.82	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	5	9	17	4.03	1107/1489	4.03	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.03	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	2	4	11	16	3.97	725/1277	3.97	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.97	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	9	9	6	3.59	1026/1279	3.59	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.59	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	4	10	10	3.96	959/1270	3.96	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.96	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	2	3	14	8	4.04	921/1269	4.04	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.04	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	20	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 1
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 8	General	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 36
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 2		

Course-Section: PSYC 335 0101
 Title: PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE
 Enrollment: 155
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1341
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	5	9	24	4.29	904/1576	4.29	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	7	12	18	4.05	1113/1576	4.05	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.05	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	8	12	17	4.07	948/1342	4.07	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	4	4	14	9	3.81	1225/1520	3.81	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	8	11	17	3.95	919/1465	3.95	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	4	6	13	11	3.61	1172/1434	3.61	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	30	10	4.25	1324/1574	4.25	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	3	8	18	2	3.61	1260/1554	3.61	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	34	4.78	442/1488	4.78	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	12	28	4.70	1017/1493	4.70	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	13	19	4.22	981/1486	4.23	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	5	10	23	4.38	834/1489	4.38	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	5	16	17	4.23	551/1277	4.23	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	5	0	1	1	3	2.70	****/1279	****	4.08	4.17	4.20	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	4	1	4	0	1	2.30	****/1270	****	4.33	4.35	4.42	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	30	0	4	1	3	0	3	2.73	1241/1269	2.73	4.33	4.35	4.41	2.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	30	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 15		Graduate
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	3
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 1		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Other	29

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 340 0101
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1342
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	5	17	9	3.91	1231/1576	3.91	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	12	9	7	3.47	1405/1576	3.47	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	12	7	10	3.67	1166/1342	3.67	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	5	8	9	8	3.58	1336/1520	3.58	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	9	11	11	3.85	1028/1465	3.85	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	1	13	11	6	3.63	1162/1434	3.63	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	7	11	13	3.97	1072/1547	3.97	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.97	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	20	12	4.29	1295/1574	4.29	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	1	2	7	10	1	3.38	1355/1554	3.38	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	3	13	13	4.27	1103/1488	4.27	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	1	1	6	22	4.63	1089/1493	4.63	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	2	6	12	8	3.73	1261/1486	3.73	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	6	13	8	3.83	1222/1489	3.83	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	2	6	8	10	3.79	869/1277	3.79	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	7	6	6	3.71	981/1279	3.71	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	3	3	7	6	3.70	1075/1270	3.70	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	3	2	8	7	3.81	1018/1269	3.81	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	10	3	1	1	3	3	3.18	782/ 878	3.18	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 24
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 1	B 10		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 5	C 7	General 4	Under-grad 35 Non-major 11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	14	27	4.58	527/1576	4.58	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.58	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	12	29	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	14	27	4.58	500/1342	4.58	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.58	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	16	22	4.37	719/1520	4.37	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	10	29	4.51	359/1465	4.51	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.51	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	8	14	18	4.07	852/1434	4.07	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	11	29	4.58	434/1547	4.58	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	18	25	4.58	1018/1574	4.58	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	18	19	4.44	490/1554	4.44	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	12	29	4.62	736/1488	4.62	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	9	33	4.79	849/1493	4.79	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	12	26	4.52	654/1486	4.52	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	6	32	4.62	565/1489	4.62	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	4	7	29	4.45	356/1277	4.45	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	712/1279	4.20	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	582/1270	4.58	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	0	2	17	4.70	511/1269	4.70	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	25	2	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	378/ 878	4.24	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.24	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 30
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B 18			
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C 0	General 11	Under-grad 44	Non-major 14
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	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 20		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 345 0101
 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1344
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	21	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	572/1342	4.52	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	7	1	1	1	4	17	4.46	597/1520	4.46	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	3	10	15	4.34	562/1465	4.34	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.34	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	4	6	13	3.79	1069/1434	3.79	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	4	22	4.48	559/1547	4.48	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	8	22	4.63	298/1554	4.63	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	589/1488	4.72	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	7	24	4.66	484/1486	4.66	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.66	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	25	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	2	7	4	10	3.72	909/1277	3.72	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	296/1279	4.71	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	31	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 345 0101
 Title INTRO CLINICAL PSYCH
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1344
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	32	Non-major	15
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	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	19				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	6	1	17	6	9	3.28	1501/1576	3.51	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	3	6	13	17	0	3.13	1511/1576	3.63	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	4	10	12	8	5	3.00	1294/1342	3.45	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	27	2	3	5	2	0	2.58	1507/1520	3.33	4.17	4.25	4.25	2.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	7	11	9	8	3	2.71	1435/1465	3.43	4.08	4.12	4.09	2.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	33	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1434	****	4.09	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	2	8	8	16	3.79	1227/1547	4.16	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	2	17	9	9	3.68	1545/1574	4.25	4.67	4.64	4.61	3.68	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	5	6	13	8	2	2.88	1488/1554	3.39	4.01	4.10	4.09	2.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	7	6	23	4.38	1018/1488	4.37	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	1	0	2	9	25	4.54	1176/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	3	6	10	9	9	3.41	1362/1486	3.76	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	4	8	11	13	3.84	1222/1489	3.94	4.26	4.32	4.34	3.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	7	4	5	7	2	12	3.43	1052/1277	3.73	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	9	9	5	3	3	2.38	1263/1279	3.09	4.08	4.17	4.20	2.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	12	3	8	3	3	2.38	1254/1270	3.21	4.33	4.35	4.42	2.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	11	2	8	7	1	2.48	1248/1269	3.46	4.33	4.35	4.41	2.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	27	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	3.55	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	39	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 17	
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C 10	General 1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 5	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 1
				P 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				I 0	Other 30
				? 1	

Course-Section: PSYC 360 8620
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI
 Instructor: RUDOW, EDWARD H
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1346
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	8	10	8	3.73	1353/1576	3.51	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	10	13	4.13	1049/1576	3.63	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.28	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	10	11	3.90	1068/1342	3.45	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.30	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1008/1520	3.33	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.25	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	0	5	8	12	4.15	748/1465	3.43	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.15	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	23	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1434	****	4.09	4.14	4.15	****	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	4	4	18	4.54	492/1547	4.16	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.54	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	625/1574	4.25	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.82	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	1	0	4	9	5	3.89	1067/1554	3.39	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.89	3.89
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	12	13	4.36	1033/1488	4.37	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.36	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	11	15	4.41	1278/1493	4.48	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.41	4.41
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	12	10	4.11	1069/1486	3.76	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.11	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	9	13	4.03	1102/1489	3.94	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.03	4.03
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	1	5	7	14	4.03	680/1277	3.73	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.03	4.03
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	7	9	10	3.80	938/1279	3.09	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.80	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	8	10	11	4.03	920/1270	3.21	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.03	4.03
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	3	8	18	4.43	702/1269	3.46	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.43	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	1	18	1	2	1	4	3	3.55	700/ 878	3.55	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.55	3.55
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	****
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 30
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 370 0101
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 136
 Questionnaires: 84

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1347
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	5	10	23	43	4.28	916/1576	3.72	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	4	5	15	30	27	3.88	1253/1576	3.62	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	3	10	7	30	30	3.92	1048/1342	3.70	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	7	7	7	12	28	20	3.64	1315/1520	3.65	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	5	22	21	31	3.95	919/1465	3.95	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	10	17	16	24	12	3.14	1349/1434	3.12	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	2	2	7	19	49	4.41	690/1547	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	12	67	4.85	586/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.85		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	7	17	35	17	3.74	1173/1554	3.29	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	4	4	10	23	40	4.12	1192/1488	3.48	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	4	7	67	4.74	947/1493	4.53	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	8	9	17	23	23	3.55	1318/1486	3.30	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	9	10	14	45	4.10	1070/1489	3.52	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	8	7	23	39	4.17	608/1277	3.89	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	5	8	6	11	19	3.63	1011/1279	3.29	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	2	5	7	10	25	4.04	918/1270	3.81	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.04	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	37	0	2	6	5	16	18	3.89	994/1269	3.98	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	37	37	3	1	0	3	3	3.20	****/ 878	3.08	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	82	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	82	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	83	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	83	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	83	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	82	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 370 0101
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 136
 Questionnaires: 84

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1347
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	28	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	62
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	33						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	10	C	11	General	4	Under-grad	84	Non-major	22
84-150	26	3.00-3.49	20	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	65				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 370 8620
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI
 Instructor: KAUTZ, MARY
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1348
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	9	0	2	3	6	6	2	3.16	1518/1576	3.72	4.24	4.30	4.30	3.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	1	3	6	6	3	3.37	1452/1576	3.62	4.19	4.27	4.28	3.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	2	2	5	5	5	3.47	1221/1342	3.70	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	1	1	1	4	9	3	3.67	1300/1520	3.65	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	1	3	7	7	3.95	933/1465	3.95	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	2	7	4	3	3.11	1360/1434	3.12	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	1	2	1	3	12	4.21	882/1547	4.31	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	702/1574	4.82	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	1	4	4	4	0	2.85	1494/1554	3.29	4.01	4.10	4.09	2.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	2	6	4	5	1	2.83	1465/1488	3.48	4.39	4.47	4.47	2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	5	3	11	4.32	1331/1493	4.53	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	5	2	6	2	3.06	1417/1486	3.30	4.28	4.32	4.32	3.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	5	6	2	3	2.94	1430/1489	3.52	4.26	4.32	4.34	2.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	0	3	2	1	5	7	3.61	968/1277	3.89	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	4	7	5	0	2.94	1204/1279	3.29	4.08	4.17	4.20	2.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1119/1270	3.81	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	5	3	8	4.06	917/1269	3.98	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	3	0	4	5	1	3.08	795/ 878	3.08	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 28 Non-major 18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1349
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	10	47	4.69	387/1576	4.42	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	11	14	34	4.35	825/1576	4.22	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	11	14	33	4.26	827/1342	4.11	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.26	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	3	7	8	9	22	3.82	1225/1520	4.03	4.17	4.25	4.25	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	3	7	19	27	4.08	808/1465	4.04	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	5	2	15	12	23	3.81	1063/1434	3.81	4.09	4.14	4.15	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	10	13	33	4.23	860/1547	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.23	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	55	4.92	422/1574	4.96	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	6	20	35	4.48	436/1554	4.28	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.48	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	17	37	4.48	895/1488	4.48	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	57	4.93	390/1493	4.90	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	5	14	40	4.53	642/1486	4.43	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	9	46	4.63	539/1489	4.46	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	14	2	6	10	12	16	3.74	902/1277	4.05	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	2	5	4	18	4.31	617/1279	4.16	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	412/1270	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	321/1269	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	33	19	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	****/ 878	3.83	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	60	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1349
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	52
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	13	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	20	Under-grad	61	Non-major	9
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	19	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 380 8620
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: RUDOW, EDWARD H
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1350
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	2	8	9	4.14	1058/1576	4.42	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	4	11	4.10	1082/1576	4.22	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	4	6	9	3.95	1020/1342	4.11	4.17	4.32	4.30	3.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	859/1520	4.03	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	11	6	4.00	850/1465	4.04	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	****/1434	3.81	4.09	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	6	13	4.48	575/1547	4.35	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1574	4.96	4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	886/1554	4.28	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	907/1488	4.48	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	683/1493	4.90	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	8	11	4.33	891/1486	4.43	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	934/1489	4.46	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	1	1	6	9	4.35	446/1277	4.05	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	12	6	4.00	802/1279	4.16	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	666/1270	4.62	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.48	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	386/1269	4.84	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	15	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	589/ 878	3.83	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 382 8620
 Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL
 Instructor: GOLDSTEIN, ROBY
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1351
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	324/1576	4.74	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	1	5	15	4.43	713/1576	4.43	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	12	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	240/1342	4.80	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	2	1	1	1	3	15	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	3	17	4.48	410/1465	4.48	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	55/1434	4.96	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.96	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	1	2	19	4.70	303/1547	4.70	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	355/1554	4.56	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	4	0	18	4.64	708/1488	4.64	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	539/1489	4.64	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	3	4	14	4.41	404/1277	4.41	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.41	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	20	4.86	189/1279	4.86	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	260/1270	4.91	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	214/ 878	4.53	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.53	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 14	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 26	Non-major 15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	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 7		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 385 0101
 Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1352
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	266/1576	4.78	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	27	4.84	194/1576	4.84	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	263/1342	4.78	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	0	1	8	20	4.53	476/1520	4.53	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	2	10	17	4.32	579/1465	4.32	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	10	19	4.47	448/1434	4.47	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	3	26	4.72	280/1547	4.72	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	21	11	4.34	1253/1574	4.34	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.34	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	24	4.72	222/1554	4.72	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	385/1488	4.81	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	29	4.88	201/1486	4.88	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	136/1489	4.94	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	3	1	6	4	13	3.85	829/1277	3.85	4.03	4.03	4.11	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	312/1279	4.70	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	260/1270	4.90	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	5	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2
84-150	15	3.00-3.49	10	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	3
				General	7
				Electives	2
				Other	15
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: PSYC 385H 0101
 Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1353
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.09	4.14	4.15	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.21	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.61	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.03	4.03	4.11	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	1	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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 390 0101
 Title NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOG
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1354
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	8	23	4.61	500/1576	4.34	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	7	6	20	4.39	772/1576	4.24	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	10	15	4.15	905/1342	4.11	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	26	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	****/1520	4.08	4.17	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	7	9	10	4.04	834/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.04	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	28	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/1434	4.00	4.09	4.14	4.15	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	26	4.64	375/1547	4.28	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	7	16	10	4.09	1427/1574	4.51	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	8	13	4	3.84	1103/1554	3.71	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.84	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	680/1488	4.64	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.66	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	27	4.76	908/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.76	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	5	19	4.21	988/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	22	4.48	719/1489	4.51	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	3	4	7	16	4.10	656/1277	4.39	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	3	2	5	2	3	3.00	1186/1279	3.30	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	3	3	4	5	3.73	1062/1270	3.32	4.33	4.35	4.42	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	915/1269	3.63	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.07	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	12	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 878	3.25	3.86	4.05	4.09	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	7	General	12	Under-grad	33	Non-major	9
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 390 8620
 Title NEUROPSYCHOPHARMACOLOG
 Instructor: LYNCH, MINDA R
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1355
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	1106/1576	4.34	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1094/1576	4.24	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	948/1342	4.11	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1008/1520	4.08	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.08	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	529/1465	4.21	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	11	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	7	4	3.92	1124/1547	4.28	4.18	4.19	4.21	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.51	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1274/1554	3.71	4.01	4.10	4.09	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	736/1488	4.64	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	973/1486	4.22	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	660/1489	4.51	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	194/1277	4.39	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	1022/1279	3.30	4.08	4.17	4.20	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	1	3	4	0	2.90	1231/1270	3.32	4.33	4.35	4.42	2.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	4	2	2	3.20	1188/1269	3.63	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	770/ 878	3.25	3.86	4.05	4.09	3.25	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 393B 0101
 Title PARENTING
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1356
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	171/1576	4.89	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	121/1576	4.93	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	185/1342	4.89	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	167/1520	4.85	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	5	2	19	4.32	579/1465	4.32	4.08	4.12	4.09	4.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	3	4	18	4.32	604/1434	4.32	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	129/1547	4.89	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	375/1574	4.93	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	116/1554	4.91	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	99/1488	4.96	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.96	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	84/1277	4.92	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	3	0	12	4.60	381/1279	4.60	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	435/1270	4.73	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.33	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.03	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 393B 0101
 Title PARENTING
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1356
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	13
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 393F 8620
 Title PERSPECTIVES: FORENSIC
 Instructor: ALONSO, DIANE
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1357
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	1112/1576	4.06	4.24	4.30	4.30	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.19	4.27	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	879/1342	4.20	4.17	4.32	4.30	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	7	8	4.38	719/1520	4.38	4.17	4.25	4.25	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	4.08	4.12	4.09	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	4	8	4.13	816/1434	4.13	4.09	4.14	4.15	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	955/1547	4.13	4.18	4.19	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	972/1574	4.63	4.67	4.64	4.61	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.01	4.10	4.09	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	1184/1493	4.53	4.67	4.73	4.70	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	0	5	8	4.27	951/1486	4.27	4.28	4.32	4.32	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	8	4.13	1042/1489	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.34	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	229/1277	4.64	4.03	4.03	4.11	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	689/1279	4.22	4.08	4.17	4.20	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	1	5	3.89	997/1269	3.89	4.33	4.35	4.41	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.86	4.05	4.09	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 406 8620
 Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY
 Instructor: MARTINEZ, MARIA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1358
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	1	13	4.56	554/1576	4.56	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	798/1576	4.38	4.19	4.27	4.35	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	788/1342	4.31	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.31		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	631/1520	4.44	4.17	4.25	4.38	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	0	10	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	6	6	4.07	999/1547	4.07	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	795/1574	4.73	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	886/1554	4.08	4.01	4.10	4.24	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	658/1493	4.87	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	561/1486	4.60	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	664/1277	4.08	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.70	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	260/1270	4.90	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	511/1269	4.70	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 16 Non-major 2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 407 0101
 Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1359
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	6	4.06	1118/1576	4.06	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	7	3	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.19	4.27	4.35	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	5	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	12	3	3.89	1179/1520	3.89	4.17	4.25	4.38	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	571/1465	4.33	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	3	6	3.61	1167/1434	3.61	4.09	4.14	4.30	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	8	2	3.44	1366/1547	3.44	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	911/1574	4.67	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	0	5	6	1	3.29	1381/1554	3.29	4.01	4.10	4.24	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	1197/1488	4.12	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	1142/1493	4.59	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	9	5	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1057/1489	4.12	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	7	4	3	3.44	1052/1277	3.44	4.03	4.03	4.04	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	2	5	2	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.08	4.17	4.31	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	908/1270	4.08	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	5	2	5	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	660/ 878	3.70	3.86	4.05	4.33	3.70	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 18 Non-major 0
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 409 0101
 Title DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCAT
 Instructor: BAKER, LINDA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1360
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	8	2	10	3.95	1187/1576	3.95	4.19	4.27	4.35	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1342	****	4.17	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	12	4.19	921/1520	4.19	4.17	4.25	4.38	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	175/1465	4.81	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	345/1434	4.57	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	5	5	3	4	2.90	1485/1547	2.90	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	832/1574	4.71	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	11	2	3.78	1152/1554	3.78	4.01	4.10	4.24	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	1142/1488	4.21	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	683/1493	4.85	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	1149/1486	3.95	4.28	4.32	4.41	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	3	2	6	5	3.25	1381/1489	3.25	4.26	4.32	4.38	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	3	9	7	4.05	672/1277	4.05	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.05	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	182/1270	4.94	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	446/ 878	4.10	3.86	4.05	4.33	4.10	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 5
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 2		

Course-Section: PSYC 446 0101
 Title INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1361
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1325/1576	3.80	4.24	4.30	4.46	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.19	4.27	4.35	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.60	480/1342	4.60	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	683/1520	4.40	4.17	4.25	4.38	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1413/1547	3.25	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.60	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.01	4.10	4.24	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1238/1277	2.50	4.03	4.03	4.04	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101
 Title FAMILY PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1362
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	609/1576	4.53	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	958/1576	4.24	4.19	4.27	4.35	4.24	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	227/1342	4.82	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.82		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	815/1520	4.29	4.17	4.25	4.38	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	498/1465	4.41	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	636/1434	4.29	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	2	10	4.29	794/1547	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1189/1574	4.41	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	347/1554	4.56	4.01	4.10	4.24	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	982/1488	4.41	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	334/1493	4.94	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	584/1486	4.59	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	448/1489	4.71	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	201/1277	4.69	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	582/1279	4.36	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	447/1270	4.73	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	559/1269	4.64	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	355/ 878	4.27	3.86	4.05	4.33	4.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 493B 0101
 Title PARTNERSHIP:US/AFGHANS
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1363
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.30	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	4.86	4.19	4.27	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.22	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.09	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	154/1547	4.86	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.01	4.10	4.24	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	118/1277	4.86	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.08	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.33	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 493C 0101
 Title: CONTROVERSIES IN PSYC
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1364
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	289/1576	4.76	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	4	10	4.29	900/1576	4.29	4.19	4.27	4.35	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	8	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	857/1342	4.22	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	744/1520	4.35	4.17	4.25	4.38	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	9	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	0	1	13	4.73	209/1434	4.73	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	673/1547	4.41	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	289/1554	4.64	4.01	4.10	4.24	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	970/1488	4.43	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	642/1486	4.54	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	2	0	2	8	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	296/1279	4.71	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	458/1270	4.71	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	322/ 878	4.33	3.86	4.05	4.33	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.77	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.52	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	3.90	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	10

Course-Section: PSYC 493L 8620
 Title LEADERSHIP
 Instructor: ROSEN, THEODORE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1365
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.24	4.30	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.19	4.27	4.35	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	683/1342	4.43	4.17	4.32	4.46	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	376/1520	4.63	4.17	4.25	4.38	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.08	4.12	4.22	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	473/1434	4.44	4.09	4.14	4.30	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	624/1547	4.44	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	508/1574	4.89	4.67	4.64	4.69	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	355/1554	4.56	4.01	4.10	4.24	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	463/1488	4.78	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	311/1486	4.78	4.28	4.32	4.41	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	463/1277	4.33	4.03	4.03	4.04	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.08	4.17	4.31	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	597/1270	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	425/ 878	4.14	3.86	4.05	4.33	4.14	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.19	4.35	4.45	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.44	4.51	4.70	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.44	4.29	4.56	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	4.33	4.20	4.19	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.77	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.64	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.52	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.70	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	4.30	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.60	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.34	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	3.97	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.67	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	3.88	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 493L 8620
 Title LEADERSHIP
 Instructor: ROSEN, THEODORE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1365
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101
 Title INTERVIEWING
 Instructor: GLYSHAW, KATHER
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1366
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	988/1576	4.22	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	851/1576	4.33	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.17	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	614/1520	4.44	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1088/1465	3.78	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	1320/1434	3.22	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	5	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1166/1554	3.75	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1388/1488	3.50	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1255/1489	3.75	4.26	4.32	4.38	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	764/1279	4.11	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	421/1269	4.78	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	258/ 878	4.44	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.44	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601B 0101
 Title CORE II
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1367
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1345/1576	3.75	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1360/1576	3.63	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1191/1342	3.57	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	1	3.38	1408/1520	3.38	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.13	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	3	2	0	2.50	1516/1547	2.50	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	1253/1554	3.63	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1324/1488	3.88	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1255/1489	3.75	4.26	4.32	4.38	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	889/1277	3.75	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	910/1279	3.88	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	814/1270	4.29	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	1036/1269	3.75	4.33	4.35	4.55	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	688/ 878	3.60	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601C 0101
 Title CORE II
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1368
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	3.63	1401/1576	3.63	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	3.50	1392/1576	3.50	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1191/1342	3.57	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	2	1	3.25	1438/1520	3.25	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	1	3.13	1353/1434	3.13	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	2	3	0	2.63	1509/1547	2.63	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	527/1574	4.88	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	3.25	1390/1554	3.25	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	4	2	3.75	1353/1488	3.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1210/1493	4.50	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1253/1486	3.75	4.28	4.32	4.37	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1352/1489	3.38	4.26	4.32	4.38	3.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	889/1277	3.75	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	910/1279	3.88	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	1151/1269	3.38	4.33	4.35	4.55	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	755/ 878	3.33	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601D 0101
 Title LONGITUDINAL DATA ANAL
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1369
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	4.86	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.17	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	483/1465	4.43	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.09	4.14	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	167/1547	4.83	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	589/1488	4.71	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	404/1277	4.40	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601G 8620
 Title HUMAN FACTORS
 Instructor: DEVRIES, ESTHER
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1370
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	****	4.17	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	138/1520	4.90	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	596/1465	4.30	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	110/1434	4.90	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	123/1547	4.90	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.26	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.03	4.03	4.08	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.89	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.70	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601H 8620
 Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT
 Instructor: LASSON, ELLIOT
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1371
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	1106/1576	4.08	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	891/1576	4.31	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	2	5	3.77	1128/1342	3.77	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1520	4.31	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	748/1465	4.15	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	314/1434	4.62	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	492/1547	4.54	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	860/1554	4.11	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	774/1488	4.58	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	806/1486	4.42	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	660/1277	4.08	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	763/1270	4.36	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	620/1269	4.55	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	764/ 878	3.29	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.29

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601I 8620
 Title SEMINAR IN SOCIAL PSYC
 Instructor: GRIFFITH, KEVIN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1372
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	3	3.75	1311/1576	3.75	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	977/1520	4.13	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	3	2	3.63	1294/1547	3.63	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1194/1554	3.71	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1018/1488	4.38	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	273/1277	4.57	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	365/1279	4.63	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.88	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.86	4.05	4.11	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601K 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO BMED
 Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1373
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	1027/1576	4.18	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	920/1576	4.27	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.17	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	597/1520	4.45	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	626/1465	4.27	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	625/1434	4.30	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1427/1574	4.09	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	871/1554	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1069/1486	4.10	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.10
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1065/1489	4.10	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1277	****	4.03	4.03	4.08	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	689/1279	4.22	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	694/1269	4.44	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.10	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601L 8620
 Title ISSUES IN I/O PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: LASSON, ELLIOT
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1374
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1495/1576	3.20	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	1333/1342	2.60	4.17	4.32	4.38	2.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1400/1520	3.40	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	708/1465	4.20	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1380/1547	3.40	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1353/1488	3.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1376/1493	4.20	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1233/1486	3.80	4.28	4.32	4.37	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	974/1277	3.60	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1064/1279	3.50	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1054/1270	3.75	4.33	4.35	4.53	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 606 0101
 Title ADULT PSYCHOPATHOLOGY
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1375
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1248/1576	3.89	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1166/1342	3.67	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1179/1520	3.89	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1166/1465	3.67	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1289/1434	3.33	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	827/1554	4.14	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	4	0	3.38	1411/1488	3.38	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1355/1493	4.25	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	1	1	3.38	1367/1486	3.38	4.28	4.32	4.37	3.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1050/1489	4.13	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	963/1277	3.63	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	764/1279	4.11	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	597/1270	4.56	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	694/1269	4.44	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	688/ 878	3.60	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	1 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 2 Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 616 0101
 Title MEAS APPL BEHAV AN
 Instructor: BORRERO, JOHN
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1376
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.24	4.30	4.43	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	395/1520	4.60	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	122/1465	4.90	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	243/1434	4.70	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	186/1547	4.80	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	237/1554	4.70	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1486	4.70	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	194/1489	4.90	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	243/1277	4.63	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	169/1279	4.90	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	478/1270	4.70	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	631/ 878	3.75	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 5 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 5 Non-major 10
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 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 621 0101
 Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT
 Instructor: INGRAM, JOYCE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1377
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	1567/1576	2.50	4.19	4.27	4.32	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	2.75	1323/1342	2.75	4.17	4.32	4.38	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1256/1520	3.75	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1337/1465	3.25	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	682/1434	4.25	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1543/1547	1.75	4.18	4.19	4.24	1.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	3.00	1567/1574	3.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1537/1554	2.33	4.01	4.10	4.18	2.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1470/1488	2.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	2.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1411/1493	4.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1455/1486	2.75	4.28	4.32	4.37	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	1466/1489	2.50	4.26	4.32	4.38	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1129/1279	3.33	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 653 0101
 Title CULTURAL HUM DEVEL
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1378
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	500/1576	4.60	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1076/1576	4.10	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1232/1520	3.80	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	1	5	3.70	1259/1547	3.70	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	1	4.10	1424/1574	4.10	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	860/1554	4.11	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	624/1488	4.70	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.28	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	645/1277	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	554/1279	4.40	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	260/1270	4.90	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	278/1269	4.90	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.10	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	****	5.00	4.08	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 665 0101
 Title ADVSEM:DRUGS AND BEHAV
 Instructor: DEFULLI, ANTHON
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1379
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	818/1576	4.38	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1058/1576	4.13	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	880/1520	4.23	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	328/1465	4.56	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	716/1434	4.22	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	527/1547	4.50	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	328/1574	4.94	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	607/1486	4.56	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	170/1277	4.73	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	532/1279	4.43	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	523/1270	4.64	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	409/1269	4.79	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	258/ 878	4.44	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.44	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.61	4.01	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 669 0101
 Title ORGANIZ BEH MGMNT
 Instructor: SIGURDSSON, S
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1380
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	8	6	3	3.33	1494/1576	3.57	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	9	7	5	3.81	1292/1576	3.81	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	4	7	3.71	1150/1342	3.52	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	7	6	3.76	1251/1520	3.93	4.17	4.25	4.36	3.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	10	4	3.76	1095/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	9	4	3.62	1167/1434	3.90	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	351/1547	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1574	4.68	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1166/1554	3.70	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	786/1488	4.33	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	1039/1486	4.02	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	6	9	4.05	1096/1489	3.86	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	3	5	5	6	3.74	902/1277	3.92	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.74
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	3	6	4	3	3.05	1179/1279	3.26	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	2	4	3	9	3.89	1008/1270	4.35	4.33	4.35	4.53	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	917/1269	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.05
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	1	5	6	2	3.64	676/ 878	3.74	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.64

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 7 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 14 Non-major 21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 10	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 669 8620
 Title ORGANIZ BEH MGMNT
 Instructor: ROSEN, THEODORE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1381
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	5	10	4	3.80	1325/1576	3.57	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	10	4	3.81	1292/1576	3.81	4.19	4.27	4.32	3.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	3	7	5	3	3.32	1258/1342	3.52	4.17	4.32	4.38	3.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	8	4.10	998/1520	3.93	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	668/1465	4.00	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	10	8	4.19	748/1434	3.90	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	2	7	8	3.95	1093/1547	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	1	0	9	9	4.37	1236/1574	4.68	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.37	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	3	3	8	3	3.65	1240/1554	3.70	4.01	4.10	4.18	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	1	6	11	4.10	1206/1488	4.33	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.10	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	3	7	8	3.90	1197/1486	4.02	4.28	4.32	4.37	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	5	8	5	3.67	1283/1489	3.86	4.26	4.32	4.38	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	6	4	10	4.10	656/1277	3.92	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	6	5	5	3.48	1076/1279	3.26	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	355/1270	4.35	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	0	4	15	4.48	669/1269	4.26	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	4	2	6	7	3.84	584/ 878	3.74	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.84	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2	Graduate	10
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0	Under-grad	12
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	Other	12
			I 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 686 0101
 Title ETHICAL & PRO ISSUES
 Instructor: BARNETT, JEFF
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1382
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.19	4.27	4.32	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1342	4.89	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	149/1520	4.89	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	678/1465	4.22	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	360/1434	4.56	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	217/1547	4.78	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	720/1574	4.78	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	278/1488	4.89	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.67	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	191/1486	4.89	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1489	4.89	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1277	****	4.03	4.03	4.08	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	603/1279	4.33	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.71	4.72	4.79	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.54	4.69	4.77	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	4.71	4.64	4.70	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.37	4.61	4.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 710 0101
 Title RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1383
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1231/1576	3.92	4.24	4.30	4.43	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1023/1576	4.17	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1342	****	4.17	4.32	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	665/1520	4.42	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	5	1	3.17	1355/1465	3.17	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	6	3	2	3.42	1376/1547	3.42	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	422/1574	4.92	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	1	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	4	0	3.27	1426/1488	3.27	4.39	4.47	4.52	3.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1401/1493	4.10	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.10	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	1265/1486	3.73	4.28	4.32	4.37	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	1329/1489	3.45	4.26	4.32	4.38	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	1114/1277	3.22	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	774/1279	4.09	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	686/1270	4.45	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	620/1269	4.55	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	8	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 9 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 3 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 711 0101
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROCED I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1384
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	114/1576	4.94	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	279/1576	4.75	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	275/1342	4.78	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	859/1520	4.25	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	7	3	3.44	1277/1465	3.44	4.08	4.12	4.25	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	6	8	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	141/1547	4.88	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1165/1574	4.44	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	449/1554	4.47	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	920/1488	4.47	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	551/1277	4.23	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	7	7	4.27	657/1279	4.27	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	736/1270	4.40	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.33	4.35	4.55	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	0	4	5	3	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	3.86	4.05	4.11	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 9 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 7 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 711L 0101
 Title DATA ANALY. PROCED. II
 Instructor: SHEPERD, KELLY
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1385
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	904/1576	4.29	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	11	4.53	581/1576	4.53	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1342	4.83	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	647/1465	4.25	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	5	7	4.29	647/1434	4.29	4.09	4.14	4.35	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	592/1547	4.47	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.47	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	281/1574	4.94	4.67	4.64	4.75	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	886/1554	4.08	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	632/1493	4.88	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	385/1277	4.43	4.03	4.03	4.08	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	0	2	2	3.67	1000/1279	3.67	4.08	4.17	4.34	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.33	4.35	4.53	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	3	0	0	3.00	****/ 878	****	3.86	4.05	4.11	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	157/ 234	4.00	4.03	4.23	4.36	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	71/ 240	4.65	4.19	4.35	4.37	4.65	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	1	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	133/ 229	4.50	4.44	4.51	4.51	4.50	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	66/ 232	4.71	4.44	4.29	4.47	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	8	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	55/ 379	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.37	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0

			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Non-major
			Other	15	
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		

Course-Section: PSYC 736 0101
 Title APPL PSYC AND PUBLIC P
 Instructor: MATON, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1386
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	203/1576	4.86	4.24	4.30	4.43	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	201/1576	4.83	4.19	4.27	4.32	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.17	4.32	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	961/1520	4.14	4.17	4.25	4.36	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	159/1465	4.83	4.08	4.12	4.25	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1045/1434	3.83	4.09	4.14	4.35	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	755/1547	4.33	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	339/1554	4.57	4.01	4.10	4.18	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.67	4.73	4.80	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.28	4.32	4.37	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	614/1489	4.57	4.26	4.32	4.38	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	4.03	4.03	4.08	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.08	4.17	4.34	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.33	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	164/ 878	4.67	3.86	4.05	4.11	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.71	4.72	4.79	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	43/ 79	4.80	4.54	4.69	4.77	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.71	4.64	4.70	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	45/ 80	4.60	4.37	4.61	4.70	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	139/ 375	4.80	4.61	4.01	4.10	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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