

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: JORDAN, LISA
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1245
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	1010/1504	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.13	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	4	7	3.71	1226/1503	3.93	4.14	4.20	4.16	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	3	10	3.90	1022/1290	3.98	4.19	4.28	4.19	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	924/1453	4.17	4.24	4.21	4.11	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	11	4.24	563/1421	4.12	4.09	4.00	3.91	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	782/1365	3.85	4.02	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	563/1485	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.13	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	3	4.14	1353/1504	4.23	4.74	4.69	4.66	4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	4	8	6	3.85	1041/1483	3.82	4.02	4.06	3.97	3.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	700/1425	4.43	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	1073/1426	4.56	4.70	4.69	4.56	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	799/1418	4.14	4.24	4.25	4.20	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	8	8	4.05	1015/1416	4.12	4.28	4.26	4.21	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	300/1199	4.33	4.12	3.97	3.82	4.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	4	5	1	3.23	1099/1312	3.31	3.85	4.00	3.69	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1016/1303	3.56	4.22	4.24	3.93	3.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	922/1299	3.87	4.20	4.25	3.94	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	0	0	3	5	0	3.63	549/ 758	3.65	3.77	4.01	3.80	3.63
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 133
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1246
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	2	13	15	30	4.22	940/1504	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.13	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	4	10	18	27	4.15	946/1503	3.93	4.14	4.20	4.16	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	2	3	7	22	25	4.10	894/1290	3.98	4.19	4.28	4.19	4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	30	1	3	2	11	12	4.03	984/1453	4.17	4.24	4.21	4.11	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	2	2	4	11	14	26	4.02	738/1421	4.12	4.09	4.00	3.91	4.02
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	33	0	2	8	8	7	3.80	967/1365	3.85	4.02	4.08	3.96	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	2	14	17	24	4.00	990/1485	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	40	18	4.31	1235/1504	4.23	4.74	4.69	4.66	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	2	1	0	12	26	7	3.83	1072/1483	3.82	4.02	4.06	3.97	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	1	6	10	38	4.48	807/1425	4.43	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	8	11	37	4.52	1120/1426	4.56	4.70	4.69	4.56	4.52
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	4	8	19	25	4.16	930/1418	4.14	4.24	4.25	4.20	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	3	6	20	26	4.20	921/1416	4.12	4.28	4.26	4.21	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	9	11	34	4.46	310/1199	4.33	4.12	3.97	3.82	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	38	0	2	3	6	7	7	3.56	990/1312	3.31	3.85	4.00	3.69	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	39	0	1	2	6	4	11	3.92	983/1303	3.56	4.22	4.24	3.93	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	39	0	1	0	4	7	12	4.21	828/1299	3.87	4.20	4.25	3.94	4.21
4. Were special techniques successful	39	3	1	3	4	7	6	3.67	535/ 758	3.65	3.77	4.01	3.80	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	60	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.13	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	61	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	59	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	60	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	60	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	60	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	60	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	62	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	61	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	61	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	62	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	4.05	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	61	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.20	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	61	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

61 1 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 16 **** 2.80 4.51 5.00 ****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 133
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1246
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	20	Required for Majors	22	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	24						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	8	C	9	General	10	Under-grad	63	Non-major	60
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	17	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: Tarnier, Nina
 Enrollment: 140
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1247
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	6	7	15	58	4.45	624/1504	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.13	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	2	9	10	63	4.51	483/1503	3.93	4.14	4.20	4.16	4.51
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	1	6	13	65	4.63	389/1290	3.98	4.19	4.28	4.19	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	33	0	2	7	14	30	4.36	656/1453	4.17	4.24	4.21	4.11	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	10	7	3	8	14	40	4.07	705/1421	4.12	4.09	4.00	3.91	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	50	3	4	5	6	14	3.75	1003/1365	3.85	4.02	4.08	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	0	7	11	66	4.70	251/1485	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.13	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	17	60	7	3.88	1455/1504	4.23	4.74	4.69	4.66	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	18	6	1	1	4	32	29	4.30	591/1483	3.82	4.02	4.06	3.97	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	3	12	69	4.71	510/1425	4.43	4.45	4.41	4.36	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	2	5	7	72	4.73	860/1426	4.56	4.70	4.69	4.56	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	3	5	13	65	4.63	426/1418	4.14	4.24	4.25	4.20	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	4	9	72	4.77	310/1416	4.12	4.28	4.26	4.21	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	2	4	2	8	24	44	4.24	503/1199	4.33	4.12	3.97	3.82	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	45	0	7	2	12	9	16	3.54	997/1312	3.31	3.85	4.00	3.69	3.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	47	0	1	7	14	9	13	3.59	1098/1303	3.56	4.22	4.24	3.93	3.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	48	0	2	1	8	12	20	4.09	899/1299	3.87	4.20	4.25	3.94	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	46	26	6	1	3	4	5	3.05	****/ 758	3.65	3.77	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	88	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	89	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.05	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.20	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	90	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	2.80	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0301
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: Tarner, Nina
 Enrollment: 140
 Questionnaires: 91

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1247
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	26	0.00-0.99	1	A	52	Required for Majors	43	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	19	1.00-1.99	0	B	27						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	12	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	91	Non-major	86
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: STARR, RAYMOND
 Enrollment: 114
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1248
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	3	4	7	10	19	3.88	1204/1504	4.17	4.27	4.27	4.13	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	7	4	11	9	12	3.35	1362/1503	3.93	4.14	4.20	4.16	3.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	9	5	5	12	12	3.30	1202/1290	3.98	4.19	4.28	4.19	3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	34	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	****/1453	4.17	4.24	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	7	7	24	4.14	642/1421	4.12	4.09	4.00	3.91	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	38	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/1365	3.85	4.02	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	3	8	8	17	3.58	1253/1485	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.13	3.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	26	4.60	1030/1504	4.23	4.74	4.69	4.66	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	7	4	7	13	9	3.33	1306/1483	3.82	4.02	4.06	3.97	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	7	14	17	3.98	1182/1425	4.43	4.45	4.41	4.36	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	6	6	29	4.42	1190/1426	4.56	4.70	4.69	4.56	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	5	6	10	15	3.49	1256/1418	4.14	4.24	4.25	4.20	3.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	6	9	6	16	3.47	1256/1416	4.12	4.28	4.26	4.21	3.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	3	4	12	22	4.14	580/1199	4.33	4.12	3.97	3.82	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	6	4	5	4	5	2.92	1182/1312	3.31	3.85	4.00	3.69	2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	6	4	7	1	6	2.88	1224/1303	3.56	4.22	4.24	3.93	2.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	3	5	5	7	4	3.17	1180/1299	3.87	4.20	4.25	3.94	3.17
4. Were special techniques successful	19	16	1	2	1	1	3	3.38	****/ 758	3.65	3.77	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.07	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	40	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.64	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	40	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	40	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.05	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	41	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	4.20	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	41	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	41	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 16	****	2.80	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: STARR, RAYMOND
 Enrollment: 114
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1248
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	12	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	10	General	8	Under-grad	43	Non-major	42
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	3						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	5						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0101
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1249
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	12	16	4.42	684/1504	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	10	15	4.26	848/1503	4.38	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	8	18	4.39	661/1290	4.46	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	385/1453	4.27	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	2	6	20	4.52	312/1421	4.45	4.09	4.00	3.90	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	28	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1365	3.85	4.02	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	8	22	4.65	309/1485	4.69	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	9	4.29	1248/1504	4.47	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	6	12	8	3.89	999/1483	4.14	4.02	4.06	4.02	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	9	20	4.57	712/1425	4.78	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	8	22	4.65	995/1426	4.74	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	10	18	4.50	578/1418	4.51	4.24	4.25	4.22	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	9	18	4.43	714/1416	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.24	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	1	9	19	4.42	359/1199	4.31	4.12	3.97	3.95	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	4	5	9	4.00	716/1312	4.01	3.85	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	764/1303	4.43	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	634/1299	4.59	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.45
4. Were special techniques successful	12	11	3	0	3	1	2	2.89	712/ 758	2.89	3.77	4.01	3.89	2.89
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.22	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C	11	General	8	Under-grad	32	Non-major	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	7	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	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0201
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1250
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	12	24	4.31	826/1504	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	11	25	4.40	649/1503	4.38	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	15	24	4.43	615/1290	4.46	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	4	16	17	4.10	952/1453	4.27	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	3	12	22	4.38	429/1421	4.45	4.09	4.00	3.90	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	4	2	6	13	15	3.83	954/1365	3.85	4.02	4.08	4.00	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	7	33	4.76	200/1485	4.69	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	4.50	1087/1504	4.47	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	1	3	22	8	4.00	850/1483	4.14	4.02	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	179/1425	4.78	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	32	4.73	860/1426	4.74	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	4	10	25	4.39	718/1418	4.51	4.24	4.25	4.22	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	5	31	4.61	525/1416	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.24	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	8	30	4.61	213/1199	4.31	4.12	3.97	3.95	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	4	2	5	6	10	3.59	979/1312	4.01	3.85	4.00	3.98	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	4	6	15	4.22	815/1303	4.43	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	4	2	21	4.63	484/1299	4.59	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	15	17	3	2	3	1	1	2.50	****/ 758	2.89	3.77	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	15
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	9	C	7	General	8	Under-grad	41	Non-major	27
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0301
 Title DEVELOPMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: SPIEGELMAN, JAS
 Enrollment: 74
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1251
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	14	30	4.49	579/1504	4.41	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.49
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	12	31	4.47	556/1503	4.38	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	10	34	4.55	459/1290	4.46	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	22	19	4.14	901/1453	4.27	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	7	12	28	4.45	374/1421	4.45	4.09	4.00	3.90	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	5	8	14	18	3.87	922/1365	3.85	4.02	4.08	4.00	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	9	36	4.67	290/1485	4.69	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	18	31	4.63	1006/1504	4.47	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	5	12	31	4.54	306/1483	4.14	4.02	4.06	4.02	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	43	4.86	255/1425	4.78	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	7	42	4.86	620/1426	4.74	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	13	34	4.65	390/1418	4.51	4.24	4.25	4.22	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	38	4.61	511/1416	4.55	4.28	4.26	4.24	4.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	4	1	8	16	17	3.89	752/1199	4.31	4.12	3.97	3.95	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	4	6	21	4.44	434/1312	4.01	3.85	4.00	3.98	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	1	5	26	4.78	321/1303	4.43	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	1	5	25	4.69	425/1299	4.59	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	17	22	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	****/ 758	2.89	3.77	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	48	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	48	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	15	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	13	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	49	Non-major	42
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	14	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1252
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	4	3	9	3.89	1199/1504	4.07	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	8	7	4.00	1052/1503	4.13	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	10	4.00	937/1290	4.13	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	878/1453	4.24	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	10	4.00	745/1421	3.80	4.09	4.00	3.90	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1365	****	4.02	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	170/1485	4.74	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	674/1504	4.58	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	4	9	2	3.65	1179/1483	3.87	4.02	4.06	4.02	3.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	2	6	9	4.11	1129/1425	4.47	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1426	4.90	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	4	7	3.74	1172/1418	4.10	4.24	4.25	4.22	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	3	8	3.63	1207/1416	4.11	4.28	4.26	4.24	3.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	3	2	4	8	3.83	780/1199	4.02	4.12	3.97	3.95	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	5	2	3	1	3	2.64	1227/1312	3.42	3.85	4.00	3.98	2.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1121/1303	3.97	4.22	4.24	4.23	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	3	1	2	4	4	3.36	1149/1299	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.21	3.36
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.22	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0201
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: RICHMAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 82
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1253
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	10	12	20	4.24	914/1504	4.07	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	11	6	24	4.26	837/1503	4.13	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	5	11	23	4.26	775/1290	4.13	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	1	3	8	13	4.32	693/1453	4.24	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.32
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	3	7	8	7	15	3.60	1056/1421	3.80	4.09	4.00	3.90	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	33	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	****/1365	****	4.02	4.08	4.00	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	9	31	4.69	260/1485	4.74	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	31	11	4.26	1268/1504	4.58	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	6	18	9	4.09	798/1483	3.87	4.02	4.06	4.02	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	35	4.83	300/1425	4.47	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	8	33	4.80	738/1426	4.90	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	7	8	26	4.46	630/1418	4.10	4.24	4.25	4.22	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	13	26	4.59	544/1416	4.11	4.28	4.26	4.24	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	10	9	20	4.20	542/1199	4.02	4.12	3.97	3.95	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	7	10	13	4.20	632/1312	3.42	3.85	4.00	3.98	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	4	9	17	4.43	641/1303	3.97	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	2	1	8	19	4.47	613/1299	3.91	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	13	23	2	1	3	0	2	2.88	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	42	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.13	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.24	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	7	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	22
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	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	33				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 230 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1254
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	0	9	14	11	3.97	1122/1504	3.97	4.27	4.27	4.26	3.97
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	8	14	12	4.03	1039/1503	4.03	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	8	10	10	3.63	1123/1290	3.63	4.19	4.28	4.27	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	12	8	12	3.94	1073/1453	3.94	4.24	4.21	4.20	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	7	13	9	3.71	991/1421	3.71	4.09	4.00	3.90	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	13	9	10	3.79	974/1365	3.79	4.02	4.08	4.00	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	12	17	4.26	750/1485	4.26	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	263/1504	4.97	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	9	17	5	3.81	1082/1483	3.81	4.02	4.06	4.02	3.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	29	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	16	15	4.39	718/1418	4.39	4.24	4.25	4.22	4.39
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	7	8	18	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	5	8	19	4.36	403/1199	4.36	4.12	3.97	3.95	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	1	5	7	5	3.60	976/1312	3.60	3.85	4.00	3.98	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	796/1303	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	537/1299	4.55	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	16	1	2	0	7	6	4	3.53	575/ 758	3.53	3.77	4.01	3.89	3.53
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	22						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	36	Non-major	22
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: JORDAN, LISA
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1255
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	3	4	11	23	4.32	813/1504	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	4	9	15	12	3.80	1183/1503	4.42	4.14	4.20	4.18	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	4	4	15	15	3.92	1005/1290	4.35	4.19	4.28	4.27	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	3	3	13	17	4.22	810/1453	4.34	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	4	7	6	23	4.20	596/1421	4.48	4.09	4.00	3.90	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	3	5	14	16	3.97	818/1365	4.13	4.02	4.08	4.00	3.97
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	8	13	18	4.15	890/1485	4.51	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	39	4.97	197/1504	4.97	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	18	16	2	3.49	1241/1483	4.11	4.02	4.06	4.02	3.49
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	13	24	4.46	830/1425	4.72	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.46
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	5	13	21	4.29	1252/1426	4.77	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	5	16	19	4.27	838/1418	4.60	4.24	4.25	4.22	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	7	13	17	4.07	1004/1416	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.24	4.07
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	3	6	5	23	4.05	618/1199	4.23	4.12	3.97	3.95	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	3	5	4	6	4	3.14	1124/1312	4.02	3.85	4.00	3.98	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	4	4	7	2	5	3.00	1195/1303	4.19	4.22	4.24	4.23	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	1	3	5	4	9	3.77	1047/1299	4.46	4.20	4.25	4.21	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	21	14	2	1	2	1	2	3.00	****/ 758	3.79	3.77	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	13	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	12
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 1	B 15		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 10	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 11	D 0	Electives	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
				Other	22
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0201
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1256
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	35	4.87	153/1504	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	11	26	4.66	324/1503	4.42	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	27	4.62	400/1290	4.35	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	2	5	6	14	4.19	855/1453	4.34	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	9	25	4.59	254/1421	4.48	4.09	4.00	3.90	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	12	2	1	6	5	11	3.88	915/1365	4.13	4.02	4.08	4.00	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	6	25	4.45	536/1485	4.51	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	35	4.92	525/1504	4.97	4.74	4.69	4.68	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	18	21	4.54	314/1483	4.11	4.02	4.06	4.02	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	11	25	4.65	603/1425	4.72	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	151/1426	4.77	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	11	25	4.65	402/1418	4.60	4.24	4.25	4.22	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	30	4.78	282/1416	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.24	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	7	12	12	4.06	614/1199	4.23	4.12	3.97	3.95	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	6	3	12	4.29	572/1312	4.02	3.85	4.00	3.98	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	299/1303	4.19	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	344/1299	4.46	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.76
4. Were special techniques successful	18	4	0	2	4	6	5	3.82	491/ 758	3.79	3.77	4.01	3.89	3.82
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.22	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	6	C	4	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	32
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0301
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN
 Enrollment: 71
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1257
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	29	4.74	284/1504	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	28	4.68	290/1503	4.42	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.68
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	24	4.57	450/1290	4.35	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	396/1453	4.34	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	11	21	4.49	338/1421	4.48	4.09	4.00	3.90	4.49
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	333/1365	4.13	4.02	4.08	4.00	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	10	28	4.74	220/1485	4.51	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.74	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	18	18	4.41	457/1483	4.11	4.02	4.06	4.02	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	35	4.95	107/1425	4.72	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1426	4.77	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	219/1418	4.60	4.24	4.25	4.22	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	31	4.81	243/1416	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.24	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	7	8	20	4.24	503/1199	4.23	4.12	3.97	3.95	4.24
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	592/1312	4.02	3.85	4.00	3.98	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	2	0	2	11	4.25	796/1303	4.19	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	484/1299	4.46	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	22	5	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	570/ 758	3.79	3.77	4.01	3.89	3.55

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	7	Under-grad	38	Non-major	33
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0401
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: CUGINI, MARIE M
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1258
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	262/1504	4.67	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	13	0	0	1	1	8	17	4.52	483/1503	4.42	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	1	1	3	8	16	4.28	766/1290	4.35	4.19	4.28	4.27	4.28
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	3	0	2	1	7	16	4.42	563/1453	4.34	4.24	4.21	4.20	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	1	6	21	4.62	235/1421	4.48	4.09	4.00	3.90	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	1	4	8	15	4.21	637/1365	4.13	4.02	4.08	4.00	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	1	1	4	23	4.69	270/1485	4.51	4.29	4.16	4.15	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.74	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	1	6	9	11	4.00	850/1483	4.11	4.02	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	1	0	2	26	4.83	300/1425	4.72	4.45	4.41	4.40	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	1	1	0	27	4.83	690/1426	4.77	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	0	1	2	22	4.69	342/1418	4.60	4.24	4.25	4.22	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	2	3	23	4.62	498/1416	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.24	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	2	5	21	4.55	242/1199	4.23	4.12	3.97	3.95	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	483/1312	4.02	3.85	4.00	3.98	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	390/1303	4.19	4.22	4.24	4.23	4.72
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	445/1299	4.46	4.20	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	22	7	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	387/ 758	3.79	3.77	4.01	3.89	4.00
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.21	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	39	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	2.80	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	12
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	39	Non-major	28
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 305 0101
 Title THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 163
 Questionnaires: 80

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1259
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	2	3	13	26	34	4.12	1038/1504	4.12	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	6	13	29	30	4.03	1039/1503	4.03	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	3	19	26	29	3.97	962/1290	3.97	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.97
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	2	5	14	25	28	3.97	1031/1453	3.97	4.24	4.21	4.23	3.97
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	2	15	23	33	3.95	815/1421	3.95	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	28	3	5	14	14	13	3.59	1108/1365	3.59	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	8	8	22	41	4.22	806/1485	4.22	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	77	4.99	132/1504	4.99	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.99
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	2	6	20	21	16	3.66	1170/1483	3.66	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.66
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	3	3	18	50	4.42	888/1425	4.42	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	11	65	4.83	667/1426	4.83	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	3	12	23	33	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	4	7	24	38	4.14	961/1416	4.14	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	2	7	12	20	33	4.01	632/1199	4.01	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.01
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	5	3	9	14	15	3.67	942/1312	3.67	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	34	0	1	1	8	11	25	4.26	789/1303	4.26	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.26
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	34	0	2	0	8	15	21	4.15	862/1299	4.15	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	34	8	1	0	6	12	19	4.26	300/ 758	4.26	3.77	4.01	4.00	4.26
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	76	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	77	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	77	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	77	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	77	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	79	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.74	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	19	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	51
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	42						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	10	C	7	General	30	Under-grad	80	Non-major	29
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	3				
				P	0						

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I 0
? 1

Other

37

Course-Section: PSYC 306 0101
 Title LIFESPAN HUMAN DEVELOP
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 113
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1260
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	1	5	16	34	4.48	579/1504	4.48	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	1	7	21	27	4.26	837/1503	4.26	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	3	6	21	26	4.19	832/1290	4.19	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	38	1	2	2	7	7	3.89	1110/1453	3.89	4.24	4.21	4.23	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	6	13	33	4.35	469/1421	4.35	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	43	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	****/1365	****	4.02	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	10	44	4.73	220/1485	4.73	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	2	54	4.96	263/1504	4.96	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	1	2	4	17	25	4.29	602/1483	4.29	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	0	13	41	4.71	510/1425	4.71	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	1	2	50	4.87	572/1426	4.87	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	1	7	11	35	4.48	604/1418	4.48	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	1	2	1	2	12	36	4.49	636/1416	4.49	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	1	1	8	11	34	4.38	386/1199	4.38	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	2	1	7	9	15	4.00	716/1312	4.00	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	1	0	6	10	17	4.24	808/1303	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.24
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	27	0	0	2	3	7	22	4.44	634/1299	4.44	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	27	23	1	1	3	1	5	3.73	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	57	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.13	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	58	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	57	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 227	****	3.93	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	58	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	58	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	58	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	57	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	59	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	59	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.05	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.20	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	59	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	58	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	16	****	2.80	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: PSYC 306 0101
 Title LIFESPAN HUMAN DEVELOP
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 113
 Questionnaires: 61

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1260
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	29						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	10	C	10	General	18	Under-grad	61	Non-major	56
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	12	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 307 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1261
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	347/1504	4.68	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	483/1503	4.52	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	9	19	4.45	574/1290	4.45	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	547/1453	4.44	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	8	20	4.55	290/1421	4.55	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	22	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	614/1365	4.22	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	210/1485	4.74	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	460/1504	4.93	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	0	8	17	4.58	282/1483	4.58	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	285/1425	4.84	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	351/1426	4.94	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	23	4.74	275/1418	4.74	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	221/1416	4.84	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	6	22	4.72	144/1199	4.72	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	3	2	6	11	3.88	832/1312	3.88	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	4	5	12	4.13	869/1303	4.13	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	645/1299	4.43	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	8	16	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.74	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.20	4.60	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	11	Under-grad	31	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			

P 0
I 0
? 1

Other

13

responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 308 0101
 Title CHILD MALTREATMENT
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 84
 Questionnaires: 59

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1262
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	6	16	37	4.53	522/1504	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	13	36	4.39	678/1503	4.39	4.14	4.20	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	8	15	33	4.36	681/1290	4.36	4.19	4.28	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	6	17	32	4.29	741/1453	4.29	4.24	4.21	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	11	18	27	4.15	633/1421	4.15	4.09	4.00	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	1	0	7	16	18	4.19	645/1365	4.19	4.02	4.08	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	5	6	13	33	4.24	772/1485	4.24	4.29	4.16	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	0	4	28	18	4.15	741/1483	4.15	4.02	4.06	4.15	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	54	4.88	209/1425	4.88	4.45	4.41	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	10	48	4.80	755/1426	4.80	4.70	4.69	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	9	46	4.68	366/1418	4.68	4.24	4.25	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	9	46	4.64	472/1416	4.64	4.28	4.26	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	6	8	44	4.66	183/1199	4.66	4.12	3.97	4.66	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	5	12	28	4.38	483/1312	4.38	3.85	4.00	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	8	37	4.74	367/1303	4.74	4.22	4.24	4.74	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	3	6	38	4.74	364/1299	4.74	4.20	4.25	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	2	0	9	11	20	4.12	369/ 758	4.12	3.77	4.01	4.12	
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	42
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	33						
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	9	C	4	General	24	Under-grad	59	Non-major	17
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	26				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 317 0101
 Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: Alonso, Diane
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1263
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	5	10	11	4.15	1010/1504	4.15	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	9	16	4.44	587/1503	4.44	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	7	17	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	374/1453	4.56	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	17	4.56	283/1421	4.56	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	2	0	1	0	4	3.57	1118/1365	3.57	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	150/1485	4.81	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	691/1504	4.88	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	4	10	5	3.86	1041/1483	3.86	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	11	13	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	23	4.74	843/1426	4.74	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	10	13	4.30	808/1418	4.30	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	17	4.41	754/1416	4.41	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	2	1	7	15	4.40	369/1199	4.40	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	465/1312	4.40	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	737/1303	4.33	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	1	1	1	11	4.33	741/1299	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	13	6	2	1	2	2	2	3.11	671/ 758	3.11	3.77	4.01	4.00	3.11
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	2.80	4.51	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	13
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 320 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSEME
 Instructor: MARTINKOWSKI, K
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1264
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13	1029/1504	4.13	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	219/1503	4.75	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	20	4.63	389/1290	4.63	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	2	0	1	1	11	4.27	764/1453	4.27	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	17	4.29	516/1421	4.29	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	2	1	1	1	9	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	134/1485	4.83	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	4	10	9	4.22	679/1483	4.22	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	90/1425	4.96	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	205/1418	4.79	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	4	16	4.43	714/1416	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	471/1199	4.29	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	5	1	0	1	9	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	3	1	2	10	4.19	841/1299	4.19	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.19
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	10						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	6	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 330 8020
 Title CHILD DEVEL AND CULTUR
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1265
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	74/1503	4.94	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	158/1453	4.80	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	63/1421	4.93	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.02	4.08	4.08	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	68/1485	4.94	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	460/1504	4.94	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	518/1483	4.36	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	224/1425	4.88	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	145/1418	4.88	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	780/1199	3.83	4.12	3.97	4.02	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	14	4.73	208/1312	4.73	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	286/ 758	4.30	3.77	4.01	4.00	4.30
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE
 Enrollment: 86
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1266
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General													
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	11	21	4.61	416/1504	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	13	20	4.61	380/1503	4.38	4.14	4.20	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	10	21	4.58	440/1290	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	4	11	11	4.27	764/1453	4.21	4.24	4.21	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	12	14	4.09	685/1421	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.01
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	0	0	11	13	4.40	420/1365	4.15	4.02	4.08	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70	260/1485	4.37	4.29	4.16	4.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	33	5.00	1/1504	4.95	4.74	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	17	9	4.25	635/1483	3.98	4.02	4.06	4.25

Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	6	27	4.82	315/1425	4.57	4.45	4.41	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	502/1426	4.62	4.70	4.69	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	26	4.79	219/1418	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	6	23	4.55	583/1416	4.21	4.28	4.26	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	2	8	19	4.59	224/1199	4.29	4.12	3.97	4.59

Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	3	7	10	3.96	765/1312	3.97	3.85	4.00	3.96
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	1	6	3	12	4.04	900/1303	4.01	4.22	4.24	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	3	1	6	12	4.09	902/1299	3.71	4.20	4.25	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	12	10	2	0	1	5	5	3.85	486/ 758	3.77	3.77	4.01	3.85

Laboratory													
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 233	3.71	3.13	4.09	4.12
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 244	4.43	3.63	4.09	4.20
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 227	4.46	3.93	4.40	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 225	4.38	3.89	4.23	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 207	4.58	3.53	4.09	4.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 19	Required for Majors	0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 6	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 5	D 0	Under-grad	35
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other		32

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 78
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1267
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	5	7	16	4.23	914/1504	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	13	8	3.93	1110/1503	4.38	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	5	16	7	3.87	1038/1290	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	10	1	0	4	10	5	3.90	1104/1453	4.21	4.24	4.21	4.23	3.90
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	6	8	10	3.82	927/1421	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	9	2	1	5	6	5	3.58	1118/1365	4.15	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	5	14	8	4.00	990/1485	4.37	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	657/1504	4.95	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	1	0	9	10	2	3.55	1218/1483	3.98	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	14	12	4.23	1050/1425	4.57	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	6	20	4.50	1128/1426	4.62	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	14	11	4	3.60	1225/1418	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	9	6	9	3.53	1238/1416	4.21	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	3	4	10	9	3.57	898/1199	4.29	4.12	3.97	4.02	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	4	10	7	3.65	952/1312	3.97	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	4	7	5	8	3.60	1096/1303	4.01	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	5	5	5	6	3.25	1166/1299	3.71	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	6	19	1	0	4	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	3.77	3.77	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	3.71	3.13	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	4.43	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	4.46	3.93	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	4.38	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	4.58	3.53	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****

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	23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 12						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	10	C 5	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	8
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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
? 0

Other

28

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: TENOWICH, PATRI
 Enrollment: 66
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1268
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	5	7	20	4.32	800/1504	4.39	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	9	23	4.59	403/1503	4.38	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	8	24	4.59	431/1290	4.34	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	4	6	16	4.46	501/1453	4.21	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	1	8	6	16	4.09	685/1421	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	6	2	18	4.46	346/1365	4.15	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	7	22	4.41	577/1485	4.37	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	460/1504	4.95	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	3	0	15	10	4.14	751/1483	3.98	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	4	27	4.65	603/1425	4.57	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	10	20	4.44	1169/1426	4.62	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.44
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	4	7	22	4.44	656/1418	4.28	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	6	25	4.56	574/1416	4.21	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	2	4	23	4.72	144/1199	4.29	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	4	6	10	4.30	559/1312	3.97	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	692/1303	4.01	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	2	1	5	3	9	3.80	1038/1299	3.71	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	521/ 758	3.77	3.77	4.01	4.00	3.70
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	1	2	3	2	6	3.71	180/ 233	3.71	3.13	4.09	4.12	3.71
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	102/ 244	4.43	3.63	4.09	4.20	4.43
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	133/ 227	4.46	3.93	4.40	4.46	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	118/ 225	4.38	3.89	4.23	4.29	4.38
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	1	0	0	1	10	4.58	52/ 207	4.58	3.53	4.09	4.14	4.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	9	General	1	Under-grad	35	Non-major	11
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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	29				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1269
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	10	6	14	3.85	1219/1504	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	12	8	9	3.59	1278/1503	3.48	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	8	11	3.74	1085/1290	3.64	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	280/1453	4.11	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	7	9	9	3.45	1144/1421	3.35	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	20	4.45	358/1365	3.91	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	3	9	16	4.13	914/1485	3.92	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	854/1504	4.85	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	3	14	13	1	3.39	1283/1483	3.52	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	3	10	9	12	3.88	1227/1425	3.97	4.45	4.41	4.43	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	7	24	4.62	1036/1426	4.23	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	5	9	10	7	3.38	1285/1418	3.66	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	7	5	12	8	3.58	1225/1416	3.59	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	9	3	5	3	3	2.48	1142/1199	2.94	4.12	3.97	4.02	2.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	5	7	4	6	3.20	1108/1312	3.08	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	5	8	8	3.83	1020/1303	3.76	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	5	6	5	7	3.40	1140/1299	3.56	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	673/ 758	2.91	3.77	4.01	4.00	3.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	2.83	3.13	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	3.16	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	3.57	3.93	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	3.67	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	3.02	3.53	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	Graduate 0
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General 0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	D 0	Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	
					Electives 0
					Other 31

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1270
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	10	6	14	3.85	1219/1504	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	12	8	9	3.59	1278/1503	3.48	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	8	11	3.74	1085/1290	3.64	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	280/1453	4.11	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	7	9	9	3.45	1144/1421	3.35	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	20	4.45	358/1365	3.91	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	3	9	16	4.13	914/1485	3.92	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	854/1504	4.85	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	2	0	1	4	7	3	3.80	1093/1483	3.52	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	1094/1425	3.97	4.45	4.41	4.43	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1319/1426	4.23	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	772/1418	3.66	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1029/1416	3.59	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	25	3	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	****/1199	2.94	4.12	3.97	4.02	2.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	5	7	4	6	3.20	1108/1312	3.08	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	5	8	8	3.83	1020/1303	3.76	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	5	6	5	7	3.40	1140/1299	3.56	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	673/ 758	2.91	3.77	4.01	4.00	3.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	2.83	3.13	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	3.16	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	3.57	3.93	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	3.67	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	3.02	3.53	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	4
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	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	31				
				? 1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1271
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	10	6	14	3.85	1219/1504	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	12	8	9	3.59	1278/1503	3.48	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	8	11	3.74	1085/1290	3.64	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	280/1453	4.11	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	7	9	9	3.45	1144/1421	3.35	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	20	4.45	358/1365	3.91	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	3	9	16	4.13	914/1485	3.92	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	854/1504	4.85	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	1	0	1	4	9	0	3.57	1207/1483	3.52	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	24	0	2	1	1	2	4	3.50	1308/1425	3.97	4.45	4.41	4.43	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	1	1	5	1	3.44	1386/1426	4.23	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	25	0	2	0	1	2	4	3.67	1201/1418	3.66	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1158/1416	3.59	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1199	2.94	4.12	3.97	4.02	2.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	5	7	4	6	3.20	1108/1312	3.08	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	5	8	8	3.83	1020/1303	3.76	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	5	6	5	7	3.40	1140/1299	3.56	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	673/ 758	2.91	3.77	4.01	4.00	3.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	2.83	3.13	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	3.16	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	3.57	3.93	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	3.67	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	3.02	3.53	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	30
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 12						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General	0	Under-grad	34	Non-major	4
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	11	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	31				
				? 1						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1272
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	10	6	14	3.85	1219/1504	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	12	8	9	3.59	1278/1503	3.48	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	11	8	11	3.74	1085/1290	3.64	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	11	21	4.66	280/1453	4.11	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.66
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	4	7	9	9	3.45	1144/1421	3.35	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	9	20	4.45	358/1365	3.91	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	3	3	9	16	4.13	914/1485	3.92	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	3	28	4.79	854/1504	4.85	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	19	0	0	0	0	10	5	4.33	543/1483	3.52	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.77
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	20	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	951/1425	3.97	4.45	4.41	4.43	3.98
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	0	7	6	4.46	1155/1426	4.23	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	21	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	630/1418	3.66	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	2	0	6	4	4.00	1029/1416	3.59	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	22	6	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	****/1199	2.94	4.12	3.97	4.02	2.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	5	7	4	6	3.20	1108/1312	3.08	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	2	5	8	8	3.83	1020/1303	3.76	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	2	5	6	5	7	3.40	1140/1299	3.56	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	10	13	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	673/ 758	2.91	3.77	4.01	4.00	3.09
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	2.83	3.13	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	3.16	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	3.57	3.93	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	3.67	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	3.02	3.53	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 12		Graduate 0
56-83	10	2.00-2.99 7	C 3	General	0
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	31

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: MCNARY, SCOTT
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 43

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1273
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	6	10	13	9	3.35	1402/1504	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	12	14	9	3.49	1313/1503	3.48	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.49
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	9	14	14	3.79	1065/1290	3.64	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	4	11	9	15	3.63	1245/1453	4.11	4.24	4.21	4.23	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	5	8	12	9	3.21	1252/1421	3.35	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	9	4	10	10	9	3.14	1275/1365	3.91	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	6	15	17	4.02	979/1485	3.92	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.02
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	1	0	0	0	40	4.90	657/1504	4.85	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	9	1	5	13	8	3.28	1321/1483	3.52	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	4	14	22	4.23	1050/1425	3.97	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	2	7	32	4.58	1065/1426	4.23	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	4	7	15	13	3.67	1197/1418	3.66	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	9	11	15	3.67	1197/1416	3.59	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	6	3	8	2	20	3.69	848/1199	2.94	4.12	3.97	4.02	3.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	6	4	7	5	6	3.04	1143/1312	3.08	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.04
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	10	6	8	3.63	1089/1303	3.76	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	1	10	6	8	3.63	1087/1299	3.56	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	16	17	2	0	5	2	1	3.00	****/ 758	2.91	3.77	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	6	5	4	7	7	3.14	216/ 233	2.83	3.13	4.09	4.12	3.14
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	5	2	7	9	6	3.31	216/ 244	3.16	3.63	4.09	4.20	3.31
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	2	0	5	3	7	12	3.96	183/ 227	3.57	3.93	4.40	4.46	3.96
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	3	2	1	6	6	11	3.88	171/ 225	3.67	3.89	4.23	4.29	3.88
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	7	4	2	3	8	4	3.29	186/ 207	3.02	3.53	4.09	4.14	3.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 70	3.20	3.95	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 67	2.40	4.08	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	2.80	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 73	3.50	3.84	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	3.00	3.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	2.00	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	4.00	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	42	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.44	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	10	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	43	Non-major	8
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	17	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: MCNARY, SCOTT
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1274
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	3	6	5	7	4	3.12	1438/1504	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	4	7	9	4	3.44	1331/1503	3.48	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	3	7	7	6	3.48	1159/1290	3.64	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	4	5	9	5	3.44	1312/1453	4.11	4.24	4.21	4.23	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	3	4	8	8	1	3.00	1305/1421	3.35	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	5	8	6	4	3.20	1262/1365	3.91	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	1	9	13	4.28	727/1485	3.92	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	263/1504	4.85	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	8	12	1	3.52	1225/1483	3.52	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	6	16	4.44	853/1425	3.97	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	954/1426	4.23	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.68
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	5	11	6	3.80	1141/1418	3.66	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	7	3	9	5	3.40	1268/1416	3.59	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	6	3	3	4	4	2.85	1104/1199	2.94	4.12	3.97	4.02	2.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	4	1	6	4	1	2.81	1198/1312	3.08	3.85	4.00	4.09	2.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	2	2	4	6	3.63	1089/1303	3.76	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	973/1299	3.56	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	2	4	3	3	0	2.58	731/ 758	2.91	3.77	4.01	4.00	2.58
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	2	2	1	2	1	2.75	221/ 233	2.83	3.13	4.09	4.12	2.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	1	4	1	1	3.00	224/ 244	3.16	3.63	4.09	4.20	3.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	2	1	0	3	2	3.25	211/ 227	3.57	3.93	4.40	4.46	3.25
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	1	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	132/ 225	3.67	3.89	4.23	4.29	4.29
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	1	0	3	2	1	3.29	186/ 207	3.02	3.53	4.09	4.14	3.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 70	3.20	3.95	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 67	2.40	4.08	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 76	2.80	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	3.50	3.84	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	3.00	3.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	2.00	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.77	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	6	General	0	Under-grad	28	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8020
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: ALONSO
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1275
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	5	7	5	2	3.10	1441/1504	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	3	4	3.10	1407/1503	3.48	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	5	2	8	3	3.25	1210/1290	3.64	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	8	4	2	3.11	1394/1453	4.11	4.24	4.21	4.23	3.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	3	6	4	3.44	1150/1421	3.35	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	7	4	2	3.18	1268/1365	3.91	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	8	4	2	2	2.67	1440/1485	3.92	4.29	4.16	4.17	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	394/1504	4.85	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	3	12	2	0	2.74	1426/1483	3.52	4.02	4.06	4.08	2.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	5	4	7	2	3.21	1354/1425	3.97	4.45	4.41	4.43	3.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	2	4	6	7	3.80	1361/1426	4.23	4.70	4.69	4.71	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	6	5	6	3	0	2.30	1401/1418	3.66	4.24	4.25	4.26	2.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	5	6	5	0	2.68	1360/1416	3.59	4.28	4.26	4.27	2.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	6	2	5	5	2	2.75	1115/1199	2.94	4.12	3.97	4.02	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	7	7	0	2.90	1186/1312	3.08	3.85	4.00	4.09	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	3	0	5	3	9	3.75	1047/1303	3.76	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	1	5	3	8	3.74	1059/1299	3.56	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.74
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	3	4	7	2	0	2.50	734/ 758	2.91	3.77	4.01	4.00	2.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	4	3	7	4	0	2.61	222/ 233	2.83	3.13	4.09	4.12	2.61
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	2	3	3	10	0	3.17	221/ 244	3.16	3.63	4.09	4.20	3.17
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	2	2	4	5	5	3.50	204/ 227	3.57	3.93	4.40	4.46	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	3	5	4	4	2	2.83	216/ 225	3.67	3.89	4.23	4.29	2.83
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	5	4	5	3	1	2.50	206/ 207	3.02	3.53	4.09	4.14	2.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	1	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	62/ 70	3.20	3.95	4.35	4.24	3.20
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	2	1	1	0	2.40	64/ 67	2.40	4.08	4.34	3.98	2.40
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	73/ 76	2.80	4.12	4.44	4.51	2.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	62/ 73	3.50	3.84	4.17	4.25	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	53/ 58	3.00	3.00	4.43	4.52	3.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	52/ 56	2.00	2.00	4.23	4.13	2.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	39/ 44	4.00	4.00	4.65	4.77	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.00	4.29	4.14	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	30/ 39	4.00	4.00	4.44	4.47	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	36/ 40	3.40	4.47	4.53	4.74	3.40

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	30/	35	3.40	4.05	4.49	4.36	3.40
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	1	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	34/	36	3.40	4.20	4.60	4.63	3.40
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	1	0	3	1	0	2.80	16/	16	2.80	2.80	4.51	3.95	2.80

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8020
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: ALONSO
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1275
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 335 0201
 Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN
 Enrollment: 81
 Questionnaires: 51

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1276
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	7	42	4.76	250/1504	4.79	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	44	4.86	132/1503	4.74	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	42	4.82	187/1290	4.72	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	1	10	37	4.67	260/1453	4.61	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	10	36	4.64	223/1421	4.48	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	16	28	4.35	472/1365	4.38	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	47	4.92	78/1485	4.82	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	45	4.88	691/1504	4.58	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	18	28	4.61	258/1483	4.60	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	48	4.94	107/1425	4.81	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	50	4.98	101/1426	4.87	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	48	4.92	101/1418	4.80	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	45	4.88	164/1416	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	7	42	4.78	114/1199	4.46	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	34	0	1	0	1	5	10	4.35	512/1312	4.13	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.35
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	35	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	227/1303	4.44	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	142/1299	4.42	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	35	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.00	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	49	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	50	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	30	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	31
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	51	Non-major	20
84-150	24	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	17	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	40				
				?	3						

Course-Section: PSYC 335 8020
 Title PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: Tarner, Nina
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1277
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	206/1504	4.79	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	368/1503	4.74	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	400/1290	4.72	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	407/1453	4.61	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	3	7	14	4.32	489/1421	4.48	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	420/1365	4.38	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	8	0	0	0	2	3	20	4.72	240/1485	4.82	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	18	7	4.28	1255/1504	4.58	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.28
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	274/1483	4.60	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	1	0	1	2	21	4.68	556/1425	4.81	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	808/1426	4.87	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	366/1418	4.80	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	209/1416	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	4	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	574/1199	4.46	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	3	3	6	10	3.91	804/1312	4.13	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	3	0	4	3	13	4.00	910/1303	4.44	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	3	0	3	7	10	3.91	988/1299	4.42	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.91
4. Were special techniques successful	10	18	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 35	****	4.05	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.20	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	2.80	4.51	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 12	Graduate 0
					Major 18

56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	33	Non-major	15
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 340 0101
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1278
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	0	0	7	29	4.70	318/1504	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	9	28	4.76	219/1503	4.22	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	7	26	4.61	400/1290	4.31	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	5	1	0	7	7	16	4.19	844/1453	3.96	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	3	7	25	4.53	305/1421	4.19	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.53
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	3	4	6	7	14	3.74	1018/1365	3.98	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	4	8	24	4.56	402/1485	4.24	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	394/1504	4.59	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	3	6	21	4.48	361/1483	4.16	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.48
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	8	27	4.72	474/1425	4.44	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	151/1426	4.94	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	6	29	4.78	233/1418	4.31	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	43/1416	4.40	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	6	5	25	4.53	259/1199	4.26	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	657/1312	4.20	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	2	0	3	4	11	4.10	887/1303	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	768/1299	4.44	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	19	15	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 758	3.75	3.77	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	12							
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General		4	Under-grad	39	Non-major	15
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	14	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		29				
				?	0							

Course-Section: PSYC 340 8020
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1279
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	1	5	3.77	1262/1504	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	1	6	3.69	1235/1503	4.22	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	937/1290	4.31	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	1	2	5	3.73	1204/1453	3.96	4.24	4.21	4.23	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	911/1421	4.19	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	603/1365	3.98	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	2	2	6	3.92	1076/1485	4.24	4.29	4.16	4.17	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	1287/1504	4.59	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	4	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1061/1483	4.16	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	1094/1425	4.44	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.94	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	1	3	5	3.83	1128/1418	4.31	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1140/1416	4.40	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	636/1199	4.26	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	592/1312	4.20	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	518/1303	4.34	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	517/1299	4.44	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	508/ 758	3.75	3.77	4.01	4.00	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.13	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	3.93	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	35	****	4.05	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	36	****	4.20	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/	16	****	2.80	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: PSYC 340 8020
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1279
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 342 0101
 Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1280
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	6	3	16	4.31	826/1504	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	3	6	14	4.15	946/1503	4.15	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	9	16	4.54	478/1290	4.54	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	4	4	7	11	3.96	1042/1453	3.96	4.24	4.21	4.23	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	1	3	20	4.58	268/1421	4.58	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	8	4	10	3.77	996/1365	3.77	4.02	4.08	4.08	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	4	19	4.54	423/1485	4.54	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	18	8	4.31	1242/1504	4.31	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	5	10	5	3.82	1082/1483	3.82	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.82

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	7	15	4.38	920/1425	4.38	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	808/1426	4.77	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	8	14	4.31	799/1418	4.31	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	4	15	4.15	953/1416	4.15	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	0	5	19	4.58	230/1199	4.58	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.58

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	5	2	14	4.22	619/1312	4.22	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.22
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	378/1303	4.74	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	3	18	4.65	455/1299	4.65	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	2	0	4	2	4	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.77	4.01	4.00	3.50

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	7	Under-grad	28	Non-major	8
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 357 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1281
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					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	1	3	10	21	4.46	624/1504	4.46	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.46
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	6	11	18	4.34	736/1503	4.34	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.34
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	15	15	4.29	758/1290	4.29	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	4	13	18	4.40	594/1453	4.40	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	13	19	4.43	392/1421	4.43	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	7	11	14	4.09	737/1365	4.09	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	1	3	12	17	4.36	636/1485	4.36	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	32	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	17	10	4.19	700/1483	4.19	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	255/1425	4.85	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	5	29	4.85	620/1426	4.85	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	11	22	4.62	438/1418	4.62	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	12	21	4.56	574/1416	4.56	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	2	9	22	4.61	213/1199	4.61	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.61
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	9	18	4.54	343/1312	4.54	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	3	4	21	4.64	469/1303	4.64	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	283/1299	4.82	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	9	7	2	1	6	6	6	3.62	553/ 758	3.62	3.77	4.01	4.00	3.62
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.77	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	13	Under-grad	37	Non-major	15

84-150	14	3.00-3.49	10	D	0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0
				P	0		
				I	0	Other	20
				?	0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 360 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 139
 Questionnaires: 55

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1282
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	7	18	19	9	3.57	1334/1504	3.57	4.27	4.27	4.27	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	6	19	18	10	3.60	1272/1503	3.60	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	6	18	16	11	3.53	1150/1290	3.53	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	46	0	1	4	1	1	3.29	****/1453	****	4.24	4.21	4.23	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	9	11	17	12	3	2.79	1363/1421	2.79	4.09	4.00	4.01	2.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	50	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/1365	****	4.02	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	4	17	30	4.42	577/1485	4.42	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	13	20	20	4.13	1360/1504	4.13	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	5	24	18	3	3.38	1283/1483	3.38	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	14	37	4.66	572/1425	4.66	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	17	34	4.60	1050/1426	4.60	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	13	25	12	3.87	1115/1418	3.87	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	6	24	22	4.26	862/1416	4.26	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	1	1	9	17	18	4.09	607/1199	4.09	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	10	6	7	5	3	2.52	1245/1312	2.52	3.85	4.00	4.09	2.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	8	5	6	8	4	2.84	1226/1303	2.84	4.22	4.24	4.27	2.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	10	1	7	5	8	3.00	1194/1299	3.00	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.00
4. Were special techniques successful	23	31	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	53	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	53	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	52	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	53	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	53	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	53	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.74	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	53	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 35	****	4.05	4.49	4.36	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	53	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	2.80	4.51	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5
			Required for Majors	6	Graduate
				0	Major
					37

28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	26
56-83	16	2.00-2.99	10	C	14
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	12	D	3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0
				P	2
				I	0
				?	2

General	6
Electives	0
Other	42

Under-grad	55	Non-major	18
------------	----	-----------	----

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 370 0101
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI
 Instructor: PROVINIE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 142
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1283
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	2	9	24	28	4.14	1019/1504	4.14	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	9	13	29	14	3.74	1216/1503	3.74	4.14	4.20	4.22	3.74
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	6	9	31	18	3.91	1022/1290	3.91	4.19	4.28	4.31	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	51	2	3	0	3	6	3.57	****/1453	****	4.24	4.21	4.23	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	3	12	19	25	3.92	839/1421	3.92	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	57	2	1	0	1	3	3.29	****/1365	****	4.02	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	2	1	9	52	4.73	220/1485	4.73	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	62	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	5	13	29	15	3.87	1020/1483	3.87	4.02	4.06	4.08	3.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	4	12	21	28	4.12	1117/1425	4.12	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	4	6	54	4.72	878/1426	4.72	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	9	21	17	16	3.59	1227/1418	3.59	4.24	4.25	4.26	3.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	14	11	35	4.17	945/1416	4.17	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	21	8	3	11	12	10	3.30	999/1199	3.30	4.12	3.97	4.02	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	7	7	13	13	3.60	976/1312	3.60	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	2	6	8	12	15	3.74	1050/1303	3.74	4.22	4.24	4.27	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	2	4	8	15	14	3.81	1033/1299	3.81	4.20	4.25	4.30	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	23	32	1	1	1	5	3	3.73	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.00	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	3.13	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	3.93	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	3.89	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	64	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.00	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.00	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	64	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.05	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.20	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	2.80	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: PSYC 370 0101
 Title SENSATION AND PERCEPTI
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 142
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1283
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	40
28-55	11	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	12	C	17	General	11	Under-grad	66	Non-major	26
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	12	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	15	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	52				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 375 0101
 Title NEUROANATOMY
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1284
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	692/1503	4.38	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	389/1290	4.63	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	115/1421	4.83	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1365	****	4.02	4.08	4.08	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	3	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	457/1483	4.40	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.40
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.47	4.53	4.74	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	22/ 35	4.75	4.05	4.49	4.36	4.75
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	3	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	4.20	4.60	4.63	****

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	1	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0101
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1285
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General													
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	7	31	4.77	250/1504	4.77	4.27	4.27	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	8	26	4.54	460/1503	4.54	4.14	4.20	4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	12	27	4.69	311/1290	4.69	4.19	4.28	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	532/1453	4.44	4.24	4.21	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	6	8	23	4.39	419/1421	4.39	4.09	4.00	4.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	26	1	2	2	3	5	3.69	1046/1365	3.69	4.02	4.08	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	5	8	22	4.18	854/1485	4.18	4.29	4.16	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	34	4.87	708/1504	4.87	4.74	4.69	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	173/1483	4.72	4.02	4.06	4.72
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	35	4.90	194/1425	4.90	4.45	4.41	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	38	4.97	151/1426	4.97	4.70	4.69	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	317/1418	4.72	4.24	4.25	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	37	4.95	85/1416	4.95	4.28	4.26	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	2	3	5	5	15	3.93	714/1199	3.93	4.12	3.97	3.93
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	4	2	17	4.57	323/1312	4.57	3.85	4.00	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	177/1303	4.91	4.22	4.24	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.20	4.25	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	18	16	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	41	Non-major	26
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 382 0101
 Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL
 Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1286
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	8	20	4.71	306/1504	4.71	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	258/1503	4.71	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	187/1290	4.82	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	418/1453	4.52	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	5	9	8	3.63	1043/1421	3.63	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	10	13	4.25	581/1365	4.25	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	200/1485	4.75	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	25	4.89	674/1504	4.89	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	12	12	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	255/1425	4.86	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	401/1426	4.93	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	158/1418	4.86	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	26	4.93	113/1416	4.93	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	11	14	4.44	329/1199	4.44	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	3	3	5	3.85	851/1312	3.85	3.85	4.00	4.09	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	808/1303	4.23	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	263/1299	4.85	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	16	11	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	29	Non-major	5
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	3						

Course-Section: PSYC 385 0101
 Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN
 Enrollment: 68
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1287
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General													
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	9	27	4.62	406/1504	4.68	4.27	4.27	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	30	4.64	335/1503	4.69	4.14	4.20	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	30	4.69	311/1290	4.65	4.19	4.28	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	8	25	4.47	486/1453	4.51	4.24	4.21	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	7	3	5	7	13	3.46	1144/1421	4.09	4.09	4.00	3.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	7	10	18	4.25	581/1365	4.28	4.02	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	103/1485	4.20	4.29	4.16	4.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	674/1504	4.58	4.74	4.69	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	16	20	4.51	330/1483	4.66	4.02	4.06	4.51
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1425	4.93	4.45	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	5.00	1/1426	4.98	4.70	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	33	4.87	152/1418	4.83	4.24	4.25	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	33	4.77	310/1416	4.84	4.28	4.26	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	3	6	24	4.43	349/1199	4.29	4.12	3.97	4.43
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	682/1312	4.42	3.85	4.00	4.12
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	845/1303	4.45	4.22	4.24	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	0	1	3	2	11	4.35	723/1299	4.59	4.20	4.25	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	22	2	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	359/ 758	3.79	3.77	4.01	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	8	C	4	General	12	Under-grad	39	Non-major	10
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	22				
				?	3						

Course-Section: PSYC 385 8020
 Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1288
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	1	21	4.75	262/1504	4.68	4.27	4.27	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	238/1503	4.69	4.14	4.20	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	412/1290	4.65	4.19	4.28	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	385/1453	4.51	4.24	4.21	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	176/1421	4.09	4.09	4.00	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	2	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	514/1365	4.28	4.02	4.08	4.32	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	3	0	5	3	6	4	3.50	1284/1485	4.20	4.29	4.16	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	6	4.26	1268/1504	4.58	4.74	4.69	4.26	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	119/1483	4.66	4.02	4.06	4.81	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	239/1425	4.93	4.45	4.41	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	251/1426	4.98	4.70	4.69	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	219/1418	4.83	4.24	4.25	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	142/1416	4.84	4.28	4.26	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	574/1199	4.29	4.12	3.97	4.14	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	215/1312	4.42	3.85	4.00	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	390/1303	4.45	4.22	4.24	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	293/1299	4.59	4.20	4.25	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	13	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	600/ 758	3.79	3.77	4.01	3.44	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	24	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 387 0101
 Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1289
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					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	0	3	14	4.82	191/1504	4.82	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	335/1503	4.65	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	431/1290	4.59	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	290/1453	4.65	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	261/1421	4.59	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	282/1365	4.53	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	190/1485	4.76	4.29	4.16	4.17	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1147/1504	4.44	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	314/1483	4.54	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	255/1425	4.86	4.45	4.41	4.43	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	620/1426	4.86	4.70	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	158/1418	4.86	4.24	4.25	4.26	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	198/1416	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	511/1199	4.23	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.23
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	111/1312	4.91	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	197/1303	4.91	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	203/1299	4.91	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	154/ 758	4.60	3.77	4.01	4.00	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 393B 0101
 Title SPECIAL TOPICS IN PSYC
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1291
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					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	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	79/1504	4.95	4.27	4.27	4.27	4.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	64/1503	4.95	4.14	4.20	4.22	4.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	173/1290	4.84	4.19	4.28	4.31	4.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.24	4.21	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	5	8	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	187/1365	4.67	4.02	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1504	4.88	4.74	4.69	4.65	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	67/1483	4.93	4.02	4.06	4.08	4.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.45	4.41	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.24	4.25	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	46/1199	4.95	4.12	3.97	4.02	4.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	14	4.61	290/1312	4.61	3.85	4.00	4.09	4.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	122/1299	4.94	4.20	4.25	4.30	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0	1	16	4.78	94/ 758	4.78	3.77	4.01	4.00	4.78

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	11	Under-grad	20	Non-major	2
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 406 0101
 Title ADV BEHAVIOR PATHOLOGY
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1292
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	522/1504	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.33	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	403/1503	4.59	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	300/1290	4.71	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	547/1453	4.44	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	151/1421	4.76	4.09	4.00	4.02	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	928/1365	3.87	4.02	4.08	4.09	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	139/1485	4.82	4.29	4.16	4.14	4.82
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	445/1483	4.41	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	541/1425	4.69	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	184/1418	4.81	4.24	4.25	4.25	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	175/1416	4.88	4.28	4.26	4.26	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	0	2	4	3	3.55	905/1199	3.55	4.12	3.97	4.05	3.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	297/1312	4.60	3.85	4.00	4.07	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	0	9	4.70	422/1303	4.70	4.22	4.24	4.34	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	203/1299	4.90	4.20	4.25	4.38	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	7	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.17	****

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	16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	3	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 407 0101
 Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1293
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	12	6	4.10	1052/1504	4.10	4.27	4.27	4.33	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	10	6	3.86	1159/1503	3.86	4.14	4.20	4.18	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	3	8	8	4.05	919/1290	4.05	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.05
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	3	5	6	6	3.75	1191/1453	3.75	4.24	4.21	4.22	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	3	7	6	3.70	991/1421	3.70	4.09	4.00	4.02	3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	8	4	5	3.45	1177/1365	3.45	4.02	4.08	4.09	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	4	6	9	4.26	750/1485	4.26	4.29	4.16	4.14	4.26
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	657/1504	4.90	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	4	6	8	0	3.11	1370/1483	3.11	4.02	4.06	4.11	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	1064/1425	4.21	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	1073/1426	4.58	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	4	11	2	3.68	1193/1418	3.68	4.24	4.25	4.25	3.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1158/1416	3.78	4.28	4.26	4.26	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	3	5	2	2	3.08	1044/1199	3.08	4.12	3.97	4.05	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	592/1312	4.25	3.85	4.00	4.07	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.22	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	2	2	2	5	3.67	1078/1299	3.67	4.20	4.25	4.38	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.77	4.01	4.17	3.50
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.00	4.44	4.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 18
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2 Under-grad 23 Non-major 5
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	15

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 409 0101
 Title INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPME
 Instructor: BAKER, LINDA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1294
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	509/1504	4.53	4.27	4.27	4.33	4.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	4.13	963/1503	4.13	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	642/1290	4.40	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	208/1453	4.73	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	139/1421	4.79	4.09	4.00	4.02	4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	159/1365	4.71	4.02	4.08	4.09	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	380/1485	4.57	4.29	4.16	4.14	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	741/1483	4.15	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.15

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	125/1425	4.93	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	351/1426	4.93	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	152/1418	4.87	4.24	4.25	4.25	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	352/1416	4.73	4.28	4.26	4.26	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	725/1199	3.92	4.12	3.97	4.05	3.92

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	78/1312	4.93	3.85	4.00	4.07	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	507/1303	4.60	4.22	4.24	4.34	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.20	4.25	4.38	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	107/ 758	4.73	3.77	4.01	4.17	4.73

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.91	4.61	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	56/ 70	4.07	3.95	4.35	4.63	4.07
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	37/ 67	4.50	4.08	4.34	4.34	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	36/ 76	4.71	4.12	4.44	4.51	4.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	37/ 73	4.29	3.84	4.17	4.29	4.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	15	Non-major	1
84-150	6	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 415 0101
 Title SEM IN COGNITIVE PSYC
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1295
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1503	4.67	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.09	4.00	4.02	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.02	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	290/1485	4.67	4.29	4.16	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.33	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.45	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.24	4.25	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	271/1199	4.50	4.12	3.97	4.05	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.47	4.53	5.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 35	4.00	4.05	4.49	4.50	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.20	4.60	4.83	5.00

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

Course-Section: PSYC 424 0101
 Title INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1296
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	2	4	5	8	5	3.42	1388/1504	3.42	4.27	4.27	4.33	3.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	8	4	3	5	4	2.71	1469/1503	2.71	4.14	4.20	4.18	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	4	4	4	6	6	3.25	1210/1290	3.25	4.19	4.28	4.32	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	5	6	4	8	3.54	1270/1453	3.54	4.24	4.21	4.22	3.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	5	5	5	4	4	2.87	1346/1421	2.87	4.09	4.00	4.02	2.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	1	2	6	4	4	7	3.35	1222/1365	3.35	4.02	4.08	4.09	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	7	6	3	3	5	2.71	1436/1485	2.71	4.29	4.16	4.14	2.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	17	6	4.21	1307/1504	4.21	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	2	3	6	3	5	3.32	1310/1483	3.32	4.02	4.06	4.11	3.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	7	5	3	5	2.92	1384/1425	2.92	4.45	4.41	4.38	2.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	3	4	16	4.46	1162/1426	4.46	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	5	7	7	3	2	2.58	1389/1418	2.58	4.24	4.25	4.25	2.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	5	3	8	5	3.29	1288/1416	3.29	4.28	4.26	4.26	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	2	6	1	4	8	3.48	932/1199	3.48	4.12	3.97	4.05	3.48
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	4	1	6	3.92	804/1312	3.92	3.85	4.00	4.07	3.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.22	4.24	4.34	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.20	4.25	4.38	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	476/ 758	3.89	3.77	4.01	4.17	3.89

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	28	Non-major	10
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	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 446 0101
 Title INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1297
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	3	4	5	5	3.30	1409/1504	3.30	4.27	4.27	4.33	3.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	2	11	3	1	2.85	1445/1503	2.85	4.14	4.20	4.18	2.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	6	7	2	3.25	1210/1290	3.25	4.19	4.28	4.32	3.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	2	1	7	6	2	3.28	1361/1453	3.28	4.24	4.21	4.22	3.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	3	3	4	3	5	3.22	1249/1421	3.22	4.09	4.00	4.02	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	3	5	5	3	3.35	1218/1365	3.35	4.02	4.08	4.09	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	0	9	1	4	2.85	1415/1485	2.85	4.29	4.16	4.14	2.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	8	4.40	1173/1504	4.40	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	3	9	3	0	2.88	1405/1483	2.88	4.02	4.06	4.11	2.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	5	6	5	2	3.00	1367/1425	3.00	4.45	4.41	4.38	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	1148/1426	4.47	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.47
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	5	6	6	1	2.95	1342/1418	2.95	4.24	4.25	4.25	2.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	8	3	4	3.26	1293/1416	3.26	4.28	4.26	4.26	3.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	5	4	6	3	1	2.53	1137/1199	2.53	4.12	3.97	4.05	2.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	5	1	3	3.25	1093/1312	3.25	3.85	4.00	4.07	3.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	4	2	3	3.42	1137/1303	3.42	4.22	4.24	4.34	3.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	5	1	4	3.73	1062/1299	3.73	4.20	4.25	4.38	3.73
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	2	4	3	2	3.45	597/ 758	3.45	3.77	4.01	4.17	3.45
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	3.13	4.09	3.78	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	3.56	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	3.93	4.40	4.16	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.29	****

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 10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 21	Non-major 11
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		

Course-Section: PSYC 475 0101
 Title CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1298
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.27	4.27	4.33	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	180/1503	4.79	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	4	19	4.67	344/1290	4.67	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	2	6	8	4.18	867/1453	4.18	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	17	4.48	347/1421	4.48	4.09	4.00	4.02	4.48
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	1	3	8	7	3.81	967/1365	3.81	4.02	4.08	4.09	3.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	170/1485	4.78	4.29	4.16	4.14	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	329/1504	4.96	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	75/1483	4.91	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	161/1425	4.92	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	251/1426	4.96	4.70	4.69	4.72	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	21	4.79	205/1418	4.79	4.24	4.25	4.25	4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	175/1416	4.88	4.28	4.26	4.26	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	349/1199	4.43	4.12	3.97	4.05	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	5	13	4.32	549/1312	4.32	3.85	4.00	4.07	4.32
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	390/1303	4.73	4.22	4.24	4.34	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	3	18	4.73	385/1299	4.73	4.20	4.25	4.38	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	2	17	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 5	C 3	General	10
84-150	18	3.00-3.49 6	D 0	Under-grad	24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0		
			P 1		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	3
				Other	13

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101
 Title ADDICTIONS
 Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1299
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.14	4.20	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	431/1290	4.58	4.19	4.28	4.32	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	578/1453	4.42	4.24	4.21	4.22	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	212/1421	4.67	4.09	4.00	4.02	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	407/1365	4.42	4.02	4.08	4.09	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	370/1485	4.58	4.29	4.16	4.14	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	778/1504	4.83	4.74	4.69	4.73	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	173/1483	4.71	4.02	4.06	4.11	4.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	285/1425	4.83	4.45	4.41	4.38	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	171/1418	4.83	4.24	4.25	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	221/1416	4.83	4.28	4.26	4.26	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	561/1199	4.17	4.12	3.97	4.05	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	651/1312	4.17	3.85	4.00	4.07	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.22	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.20	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.17	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	12	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101
 Title COMMUNITY & SOCIAL TOP
 Instructor: MATON, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1300
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	700/1504	4.40	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.19	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	596/1421	4.20	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1153/1365	3.50	4.02	4.08	4.35	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	119/1483	4.80	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	297/1312	4.60	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	299/1303	4.80	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1299	4.80	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	154/ 758	4.60	3.77	4.01	4.24	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.91	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	3.95	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	37/ 67	4.50	4.08	4.34	4.48	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 76	4.67	4.12	4.44	4.39	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	3.84	4.17	4.15	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	1	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 2
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 4		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 601B 0101
 Title MENTAL RETARDATION
 Instructor: RICHMAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1301
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1302/1504	3.67	4.27	4.27	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1472/1503	2.67	4.14	4.20	4.28	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	0	1	2.67	1271/1290	2.67	4.19	4.28	4.36	2.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	0	2	3.50	1282/1453	3.50	4.24	4.21	4.34	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1104/1365	3.60	4.02	4.08	4.35	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1030/1504	4.60	4.74	4.69	4.79	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1411/1483	2.83	4.02	4.06	4.20	2.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1334/1425	3.33	4.45	4.41	4.51	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1319/1426	4.00	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1330/1418	3.00	4.24	4.25	4.36	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1199/1416	3.67	4.28	4.26	4.38	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	4.12	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1149/1312	3.00	3.85	4.00	4.31	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1153/1299	3.33	4.20	4.25	4.56	3.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	50/ 76	4.67	4.91	4.61	4.57	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	65/ 70	2.60	3.95	4.35	4.21	2.60
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	56/ 67	3.50	4.08	4.34	4.48	3.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	68/ 76	3.67	4.12	4.44	4.39	3.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	3.17	65/ 73	3.17	3.84	4.17	4.15	3.17

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 604 0101
 Title BIOL BASES OF BHVR DEV
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1302
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1224/1504	3.85	4.27	4.27	4.44	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	4	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1042/1290	3.86	4.19	4.28	4.36	3.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	4	2	3.15	1273/1421	3.15	4.09	4.00	4.27	3.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1104/1365	3.60	4.02	4.08	4.35	3.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	5	2	4	3.91	1086/1485	3.91	4.29	4.16	4.24	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	1164/1504	4.42	4.74	4.69	4.79	4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	8	0	3.73	1141/1483	3.73	4.02	4.06	4.20	3.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	270/1425	4.85	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	825/1426	4.75	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	539/1418	4.54	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	769/1416	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	207/1199	4.62	4.12	3.97	4.04	4.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.85	4.00	4.31	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	796/1303	4.25	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	667/1299	4.42	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	1	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.24	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	1	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.15	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.00	4.43	4.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 56	****	2.00	4.23	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.47	4.53	4.37	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 8	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			

56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 605 0101
 Title LEARNING AND COGNITION
 Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1303
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	853/1290	4.17	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	623/1421	4.17	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	672/1365	4.17	4.02	4.08	4.35	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1485	4.83	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	731/1483	4.17	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1094/1425	4.17	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	221/1416	4.83	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	105/1199	4.80	4.12	3.97	4.04	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	1	3.67	947/1312	3.67	3.85	4.00	4.31	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	3.67	1078/1299	3.67	4.20	4.25	4.56	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	3.77	4.01	4.24	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 616 0101
 Title MEAS APPL BEHAV AN
 Instructor: KAHNG, SUNG W
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1304
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	972/1504	4.18	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	707/1503	4.36	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	832/1290	4.20	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	300/1453	4.64	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	365/1421	4.45	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	654/1365	4.18	4.02	4.08	4.35	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	636/1485	4.36	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	657/1504	4.91	4.74	4.69	4.79	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	409/1483	4.44	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	842/1425	4.45	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	1096/1426	4.55	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1418	4.73	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	854/1416	4.27	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.27
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	587/1199	4.13	4.12	3.97	4.04	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	414/1312	4.45	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	619/1303	4.45	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	841/1299	4.18	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	343/ 758	4.17	3.77	4.01	4.24	4.17
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	5	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	8	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 621 0101
 Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT
 Instructor: MORAN, MARIANNE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1305
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1504	4.88	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	357/1503	4.63	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	250/1290	4.75	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	310/1453	4.63	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	439/1421	4.38	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.02	4.08	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	990/1485	4.00	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1014/1504	4.63	4.74	4.69	4.79	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	751/1483	4.14	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1110/1418	3.88	4.24	4.25	4.36	3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	498/1416	4.63	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	574/1199	4.14	4.12	3.97	4.04	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	986/1312	3.57	3.85	4.00	4.31	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	863/1303	4.14	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.14
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	922/1299	4.00	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	580/ 758	3.50	3.77	4.01	4.24	3.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 622 0101
 Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN I
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1306
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1247/1503	3.67	4.14	4.20	4.28	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1143/1290	3.56	4.19	4.28	4.36	3.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1001/1453	4.00	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1365	****	4.02	4.08	4.35	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	761/1485	4.25	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	724/1425	4.56	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	656/1418	4.44	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	177/1199	4.67	4.12	3.97	4.04	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	682/1312	4.11	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	3	1	1	3	3.22	1171/1299	3.22	4.20	4.25	4.56	3.22
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	293/ 758	4.29	3.77	4.01	4.24	4.29

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	8	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
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	2	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 645 0101
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1307
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	1262/1504	3.77	4.27	4.27	4.44	3.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	3	2	3.31	1372/1503	3.31	4.14	4.20	4.28	3.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1091/1290	3.71	4.19	4.28	4.36	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1093/1453	3.92	4.24	4.21	4.34	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	5	4.00	745/1421	4.00	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1097/1365	3.62	4.02	4.08	4.35	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	0	6	1	3	3.08	1380/1485	3.08	4.29	4.16	4.24	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	5	2	2	3.36	1291/1483	3.36	4.02	4.06	4.20	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	1100/1425	4.15	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	1104/1426	4.54	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	4	3	3	3.46	1262/1418	3.46	4.24	4.25	4.36	3.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	5	5	3.85	1126/1416	3.85	4.28	4.26	4.38	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	429/1199	4.33	4.12	3.97	4.04	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	5	1	2	1	2.55	1241/1312	2.55	3.85	4.00	4.31	2.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	3	2	3	2	3.18	1179/1303	3.18	4.22	4.24	4.58	3.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	3	2	2	3	3.27	1163/1299	3.27	4.20	4.25	4.56	3.27
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 653 0101
 Title CULTURAL HUM DEVEL
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1308
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	1	2	2	1	2.25	1498/1504	2.25	4.27	4.27	4.44	2.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	2	1	3	0	2.08	1495/1503	2.08	4.14	4.20	4.28	2.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	8	2	1	1	2.58	1274/1290	2.58	4.19	4.28	4.36	2.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	4	2	0	2.50	1443/1453	2.50	4.24	4.21	4.34	2.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	2	2	3	3.17	1269/1421	3.17	4.09	4.00	4.27	3.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	2	2	1	2.50	1347/1365	2.50	4.02	4.08	4.35	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	7	2	2	0	0	1.55	1485/1485	1.55	4.29	4.16	4.24	1.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	891/1504	4.75	4.74	4.69	4.79	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	6	1	3	1	1	2.17	1463/1483	2.17	4.02	4.06	4.20	2.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	7	1	1	2	0	1.82	1420/1425	1.82	4.45	4.41	4.51	1.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	4	0	5	3.55	1379/1426	3.55	4.70	4.69	4.80	3.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	3	2	2	0	2.18	1406/1418	2.18	4.24	4.25	4.36	2.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	2	2	0	0	1.55	1410/1416	1.55	4.28	4.26	4.38	1.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1199	****	4.12	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	2	2	2.92	1182/1312	2.92	3.85	4.00	4.31	2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	3	2	3	4	3.67	1076/1303	3.67	4.22	4.24	4.58	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1106/1299	3.50	4.20	4.25	4.56	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	667/ 758	3.14	3.77	4.01	4.24	3.14
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.40	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 686 0101
 Title ETHICAL & PRO ISSUES
 Instructor: BARNETT, JEFF
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1309
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	8	13	4.23	914/1504	4.23	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	15	4.35	736/1503	4.35	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	766/1290	4.27	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	13	4.42	563/1453	4.42	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	8	6	8	3.65	1023/1421	3.65	4.09	4.00	4.27	3.65
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	5	15	4.27	569/1365	4.27	4.02	4.08	4.35	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	10	12	4.19	830/1485	4.19	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	525/1504	4.92	4.74	4.69	4.79	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	2	16	4	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	402/1425	4.77	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	201/1426	4.96	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	247/1418	4.77	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	5	18	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	1	7	10	4	3.77	810/1199	3.77	4.12	3.97	4.04	3.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	572/1312	4.29	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	401/1303	4.71	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	523/1299	4.57	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	5	14	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	114/ 758	4.71	3.77	4.01	4.24	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	18	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	20
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	18	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 695A 0101
 Title: DIVERSITY
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1310
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	406/1504	4.62	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	678/1503	4.38	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	320/1453	4.62	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	194/1421	4.69	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	441/1365	4.38	4.02	4.08	4.35	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	260/1485	4.69	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1345/1504	4.15	4.74	4.69	4.79	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1227/1425	3.89	4.45	4.41	4.51	3.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	972/1418	4.11	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	498/1416	4.63	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	820/1199	3.75	4.12	3.97	4.04	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	234/1312	4.69	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	258/1303	4.85	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	550/1299	4.54	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	273/ 758	4.33	3.77	4.01	4.24	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	4	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 695B 0101
 Title MEDICAL NEUROPSYCHOLOG
 Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1311
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	240/1453	4.70	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	261/1421	4.58	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	558/1365	4.27	4.02	4.08	4.35	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	5	6	0	3.55	1477/1504	3.55	4.74	4.69	4.79	3.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	6	4	4.08	804/1483	4.08	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	4	6	4.27	1022/1425	4.27	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	1008/1426	4.64	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	913/1418	4.18	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	997/1416	4.09	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	987/1199	3.33	4.12	3.97	4.04	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	870/1312	3.82	3.85	4.00	4.31	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	288/1303	4.82	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	385/1299	4.73	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	364/ 758	4.13	3.77	4.01	4.24	4.13
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.91	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.08	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	58/ 76	4.00	4.12	4.44	4.39	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	44/ 73	4.00	3.84	4.17	4.15	4.00

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	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	3	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 696 0101
 Title GRAD SEM TCHG
 Instructor: JORDAN, LISA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1312
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.14	4.20	4.28	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.24	4.21	4.34	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.02	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.45	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.70	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.24	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	4.12	3.97	4.04	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	1	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 710 0101
 Title RESEARCH METHODS
 Instructor: MURPHY, CHRISTO
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1313
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	6	8	0	3.11	1439/1504	3.11	4.27	4.27	4.44	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	4	0	2.83	1448/1503	2.83	4.14	4.20	4.28	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	5	1	3.06	1234/1290	3.06	4.19	4.28	4.36	3.06
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	6	8	1	3.33	1348/1453	3.33	4.24	4.21	4.34	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	5	6	1	2.89	1341/1421	2.89	4.09	4.00	4.27	2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	8	2	3.41	1196/1365	3.41	4.02	4.08	4.35	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	4	5	3	2	2.72	1432/1485	2.72	4.29	4.16	4.24	2.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	3	10	4	0	3.06	1374/1483	3.06	4.02	4.06	4.20	3.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	6	6	5	0	2.83	1394/1425	2.83	4.45	4.41	4.51	2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	5	4	5	2	3.00	1406/1426	3.00	4.70	4.69	4.80	3.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	6	5	0	2.83	1358/1418	2.83	4.24	4.25	4.36	2.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	4	8	3	0	2.61	1367/1416	2.61	4.28	4.26	4.38	2.61
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	14	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1199	****	4.12	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	5	9	2	0	2.71	1219/1312	2.71	3.85	4.00	4.31	2.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	4	5	5	1	3.06	1192/1303	3.06	4.22	4.24	4.58	3.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	3	4	5	2	3.13	1187/1299	3.13	4.20	4.25	4.56	3.13
4. Were special techniques successful	1	15	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 758	****	3.77	4.01	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.91	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	3.95	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.08	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.12	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	3.84	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	11	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	18
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: PSYC 711 0101
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROCED I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1314
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	750/1504	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	472/1503	4.53	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	440/1290	4.58	4.19	4.28	4.36	4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	0	6	9	4.05	712/1421	4.05	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	1	3	11	4.11	726/1365	4.11	4.02	4.08	4.35	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	380/1485	4.58	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	668/1483	4.22	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	270/1425	4.84	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	525/1426	4.89	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	8	6	3.95	1064/1418	3.95	4.24	4.25	4.36	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	5	10	4.05	1011/1416	4.05	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	15	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1199	****	4.12	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1312	****	3.85	4.00	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1303	****	4.22	4.24	4.58	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1299	****	4.20	4.25	4.56	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	3.13	4.09	4.56	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	3.63	4.09	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	3.93	4.40	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 225	****	3.89	4.23	4.69	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 207	****	3.53	4.09	4.40	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	15	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	6	Non-major	21
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 711L 0101
 Title DATA ANALY. PROCED. II
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1315
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	11	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	649/1503	4.40	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	12	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1290	****	4.19	4.28	4.36	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	13	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1453	****	4.24	4.21	4.34	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	13	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1421	****	4.09	4.00	4.27	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	13	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1365	****	4.02	4.08	4.35	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	13	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/1485	****	4.29	4.16	4.24	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	6	1	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	4.02	4.06	4.20	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1425	****	4.45	4.41	4.51	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1426	****	4.70	4.69	4.80	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1418	****	4.24	4.25	4.36	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1416	****	4.28	4.26	4.38	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1199	****	4.12	3.97	4.04	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1312	****	3.85	4.00	4.31	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1303	****	4.22	4.24	4.58	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1299	****	4.20	4.25	4.56	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	1	1	4	5	2	3.46	195/ 233	3.46	3.13	4.09	4.56	3.46
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	134/ 244	4.23	3.63	4.09	4.09	4.23
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	133/ 227	4.46	3.93	4.40	4.66	4.46
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	152/ 225	4.08	3.89	4.23	4.69	4.08
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	6	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	106/ 207	4.00	3.53	4.09	4.40	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 736 0101
 Title APPL PSYC AND PUBLIC P
 Instructor: MATON, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1316
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	206/1504	4.80	4.27	4.27	4.44	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	380/1503	4.60	4.14	4.20	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.19	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	331/1453	4.60	4.24	4.21	4.34	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	194/1421	4.70	4.09	4.00	4.27	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	370/1365	4.44	4.02	4.08	4.35	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	349/1485	4.60	4.29	4.16	4.24	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.74	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	137/1483	4.78	4.02	4.06	4.20	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	420/1425	4.75	4.45	4.41	4.51	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	572/1426	4.88	4.70	4.69	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	426/1418	4.63	4.24	4.25	4.36	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	175/1416	4.88	4.28	4.26	4.38	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	495/1199	4.25	4.12	3.97	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	297/1312	4.60	3.85	4.00	4.31	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	197/1303	4.90	4.22	4.24	4.58	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	203/1299	4.90	4.20	4.25	4.56	4.90
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	146/ 758	4.63	3.77	4.01	4.24	4.63
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	37/ 76	4.89	4.91	4.61	4.57	4.89
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	24/ 70	4.89	3.95	4.35	4.21	4.89
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	35/ 67	4.56	4.08	4.34	4.48	4.56
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	25/ 76	4.89	4.12	4.44	4.39	4.89
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	43/ 73	4.11	3.84	4.17	4.15	4.11

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	8	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	2	Non-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	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						