

Course-Section: HIST 100 0101
 Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 881
 JAN 19, 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	1	6	10	13	4.17	985/1556	4.10	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	19	4.53	474/1557	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	20	4.57	415/1335	4.19	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	6	10	9	3.89	1115/1510	3.95	4.19	4.19	4.07	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	9	9	11	4.07	697/1479	4.08	4.18	3.97	3.90	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	7	11	3.70	1084/1424	3.64	4.05	4.08	3.91	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	21	4.60	364/1537	4.15	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	476/1553	4.63	4.62	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	543/1536	3.97	4.24	4.07	3.91	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	23	4.67	595/1487	4.64	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	1100/1491	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	19	4.55	532/1489	4.42	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	19	4.48	665/1481	4.44	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	5	8	15	4.28	437/1246	3.70	3.88	3.93	3.78	4.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	2	4	5	3.77	931/1411	3.63	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	5	3	3	3.58	1161/1413	3.84	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	1	4	2	4	3.58	1194/1408	4.17	4.28	4.27	4.03	3.58
4. Were special techniques successful	18	6	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	****/ 856	3.04	3.72	4.00	3.87	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.02	4.03	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	2	B	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	30	Non-major	28
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	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	1	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 100 0201
 Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: HERBERT, SANDRA
 Enrollment: 73
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 882
 JAN 19, 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	2	3	19	20	4.22	925/1556	4.10	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	2	7	17	18	4.09	1017/1557	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	19	25	4.53	449/1335	4.19	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	27	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	1058/1510	3.95	4.19	4.19	4.07	3.94
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	3	7	13	19	4.07	697/1479	4.08	4.18	3.97	3.90	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	32	4	1	3	3	2	2.85	1385/1424	3.64	4.05	4.08	3.91	2.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	5	13	22	4.11	925/1537	4.15	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	8	25	12	4.09	1412/1553	4.63	4.62	4.69	4.66	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	1	7	16	7	3.94	977/1536	3.97	4.24	4.07	3.91	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	13	27	4.50	816/1487	4.64	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	9	33	4.70	942/1491	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	15	21	4.27	875/1489	4.42	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	3	11	28	4.51	624/1481	4.44	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	4	10	16	12	3.79	774/1246	3.70	3.88	3.93	3.78	3.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	2	12	8	11	3.61	1019/1411	3.63	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	2	3	7	9	15	3.89	1035/1413	3.84	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	6	15	15	4.25	825/1408	4.17	4.28	4.27	4.03	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	11	24	4	2	4	1	1	2.42	838/ 856	3.04	3.72	4.00	3.87	2.42

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	13	Required for Majors	27	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	8	General	4	Under-grad	47	Non-major	43
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HIST 100 0301
 Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 883
 JAN 19, 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	5	12	7	3.96	1160/1556	4.10	4.45	4.25	4.06	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	15	4.28	805/1557	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.28
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	18	4.56	415/1335	4.19	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	6	10	7	4.04	958/1510	3.95	4.19	4.19	4.07	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	10	12	4.20	579/1479	4.08	4.18	3.97	3.90	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	6	6	8	3.82	984/1424	3.64	4.05	4.08	3.91	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	5	7	11	4.13	915/1537	4.15	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1553	4.63	4.62	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	4	7	5	3.94	961/1536	3.97	4.24	4.07	3.91	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	1	22	4.72	506/1487	4.64	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	21	4.76	834/1491	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	0	5	17	4.44	683/1489	4.42	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	18	4.52	610/1481	4.44	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	3	8	12	4.29	423/1246	3.70	3.88	3.93	3.78	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	3	1	4	3	4	3.27	1190/1411	3.63	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	3	0	2	4	7	3.75	1094/1413	3.84	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	4	1	9	4.00	981/1408	4.17	4.28	4.27	4.03	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	517/ 856	3.04	3.72	4.00	3.87	3.86
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 101	****	4.02	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.35	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	4.09	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	****	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	4.57	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type		Majors		
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	25	Non-major	24
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 100 0401
 Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: FROIDE, AMY
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 884
 JAN 19, 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	0	3	7	10	4.19	955/1556	4.10	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	15	4.38	686/1557	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	11	4.29	760/1335	4.19	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	4	10	4.16	859/1510	3.95	4.19	4.19	4.07	4.16
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	498/1479	4.08	4.18	3.97	3.90	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	657/1424	3.64	4.05	4.08	3.91	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	0	8	8	3.81	1171/1537	4.15	4.24	4.15	4.12	3.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1553	4.63	4.62	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	3	9	6	3.95	946/1536	3.97	4.24	4.07	3.91	3.95
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	543/1487	4.64	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	1233/1491	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	741/1489	4.42	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	638/1481	4.44	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	3	4	1	7	2	3.06	1108/1246	3.70	3.88	3.93	3.78	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	2	1	4	5	3.77	931/1411	3.63	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	1	2	8	4.23	814/1413	3.84	4.19	4.23	3.96	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	630/1408	4.17	4.28	4.27	4.03	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	4	0	4	2	2	2.83	811/ 856	3.04	3.72	4.00	3.87	2.83
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.03	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	3.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	4.09	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 10	Graduate 0
					Major 1

56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 100 0501
 Title WESTERN CIVILIZATION
 Instructor: Herz, Nicole
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 885
 JAN 19, 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	1	6	10	7	3.96	1170/1556	4.10	4.45	4.25	4.06	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	10	5	3.71	1313/1557	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	6	10	2	4	3.00	1263/1335	4.19	4.36	4.24	4.13	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	2	7	6	7	3.70	1254/1510	3.95	4.19	4.19	4.07	3.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	7	12	4	3.79	953/1479	4.08	4.18	3.97	3.90	3.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	9	6	3.65	1120/1424	3.64	4.05	4.08	3.91	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	3	6	12	4.13	915/1537	4.15	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	19	4	4.13	1389/1553	4.63	4.62	4.69	4.66	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	7	10	1	3.67	1201/1536	3.97	4.24	4.07	3.91	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	4	18	4.63	665/1487	4.64	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	713/1491	4.67	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	7	13	4.43	698/1489	4.42	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	5	12	4.17	975/1481	4.44	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	4	5	2	9	3	3.09	1105/1246	3.70	3.88	3.93	3.78	3.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	6	5	7	3.71	961/1411	3.63	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	7	5	7	3.76	1090/1413	3.84	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	528/1408	4.17	4.28	4.27	4.03	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	3	0	7	3	2	3.07	762/ 856	3.04	3.72	4.00	3.87	3.07
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	3.94	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	3.72	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	4.09	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.18	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors

Grade	Count	Grade Range	Count	Category	Count	Level	Count	Level	Count
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	4	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9			Major	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0			Non-major	25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P	0				
				I	0	Other	2		
				?	0				

Course-Section: HIST 101 0101
 Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 886
 JAN 19, 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	7	11	24	4.40	701/1556	4.20	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	9	16	17	4.19	907/1557	4.10	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	14	20	4.26	778/1335	4.06	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	9	10	19	4.15	859/1510	3.97	4.19	4.19	4.07	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	10	25	4.36	436/1479	4.29	4.18	3.97	3.90	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	8	17	13	3.95	861/1424	3.92	4.05	4.08	3.91	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	11	25	4.46	532/1537	4.18	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	30	4.73	927/1553	4.81	4.62	4.69	4.66	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	4	21	8	4.12	787/1536	3.81	4.24	4.07	3.91	4.12
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	9	30	4.68	560/1487	4.22	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	39	4.93	410/1491	4.86	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	14	24	4.59	493/1489	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	32	4.75	315/1481	4.54	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	5	8	26	4.45	301/1246	3.86	3.88	3.93	3.78	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	8	16	12	3.90	845/1411	3.73	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	2	4	12	21	4.33	730/1413	4.04	4.19	4.23	3.96	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	4	5	30	4.67	451/1408	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.03	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	3	3	11	9	5	3.32	711/ 856	2.89	3.72	4.00	3.87	3.32
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	3.94	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	39	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	39	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 238	****	****	4.26	4.00	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	39	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	3.93	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.19	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.35	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	38	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	38	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	38	1	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	4.09	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	38	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	38	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	****/ 16	****	****	4.36	4.63	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

38 0 0 1 1 1 1 3.50 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.51 4.57 ****

Course-Section: HIST 101 0101
 Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 75
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 886
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	3	A	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	20						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	9	Under-grad	42	Non-major	39
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	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	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 101 0201
 Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18
 Instructor: JOHNSON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 887
 JAN 19, 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	6	6	13	4.00	1121/1556	4.20	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	6	12	4.00	1065/1557	4.10	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	6	8	10	3.85	1053/1335	4.06	4.36	4.24	4.13	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	1	3	2	12	6	3.79	1186/1510	3.97	4.19	4.19	4.07	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	8	14	4.22	551/1479	4.29	4.18	3.97	3.90	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	0	1	11	10	3.88	931/1424	3.92	4.05	4.08	3.91	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	3	5	7	11	3.89	1123/1537	4.18	4.24	4.15	4.12	3.89
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	1	25	4.89	712/1553	4.81	4.62	4.69	4.66	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	4	4	13	1	3.50	1289/1536	3.81	4.24	4.07	3.91	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	3	5	12	5	3.76	1333/1487	4.22	4.60	4.44	4.37	3.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	763/1491	4.86	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	3	8	10	3.96	1127/1489	4.27	4.43	4.27	4.18	3.96
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	1	6	15	4.32	851/1481	4.54	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	4	2	9	3	7	3.28	1044/1246	3.86	3.88	3.93	3.78	3.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	2	4	11	4	3.57	1041/1411	3.73	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	0	4	9	7	3.74	1101/1413	4.04	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.74
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	3	2	5	11	3.87	1089/1408	4.27	4.28	4.27	4.03	3.87
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	6	0	2	5	0	2.46	833/ 856	2.89	3.72	4.00	3.87	2.46
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	3.94	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	3.92	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.03	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	3.72	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	3.93	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.02	4.03	3.92	****
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	3.39	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	4.09	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.01	4.21	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.18	4.51	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.51	4.57	****

Course-Section: HIST 101 0201
 Title AMERICAN HISTORY TO 18
 Instructor: JOHNSON, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 887
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	2	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	6	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 102 0101
 Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877
 Instructor: BECKER, MARTIN
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 888
 JAN 19, 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	1	8	16	4.50	537/1556	4.53	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	9	15	4.50	515/1557	4.55	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	16	4.48	512/1335	4.61	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	340/1510	4.43	4.19	4.19	4.07	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	9	10	4.08	685/1479	4.00	4.18	3.97	3.90	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	6	11	3.92	894/1424	3.94	4.05	4.08	3.91	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	8	14	4.35	681/1537	4.54	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.35
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1553	4.54	4.62	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	9	13	4.32	577/1536	4.47	4.24	4.07	3.91	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	332/1487	4.76	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	410/1491	4.86	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	454/1489	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	388/1481	4.76	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	15	2	1	3	1	4	3.36	1014/1246	3.70	3.88	3.93	3.78	3.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	2	6	2	8	3.36	1140/1411	3.53	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	5	4	4	7	3.41	1225/1413	3.54	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.41
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	5	4	2	9	3.50	1218/1408	3.90	4.28	4.27	4.03	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	20	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	26	Non-major	25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 102 0201
 Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877
 Instructor: FISCHER, LAWREN
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 889
 JAN 19, 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	2	8	19	4.59	439/1556	4.53	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	20	4.62	356/1557	4.55	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	10	18	4.59	392/1335	4.61	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	11	11	4.43	530/1510	4.43	4.19	4.19	4.07	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	9	13	4.03	716/1479	4.00	4.18	3.97	3.90	4.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	6	15	6	4.00	806/1424	3.94	4.05	4.08	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	23	4.66	298/1537	4.54	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.66
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1553	4.54	4.62	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	15	9	4.32	577/1536	4.47	4.24	4.07	3.91	4.32
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	256/1487	4.76	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	23	4.82	713/1491	4.86	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	326/1489	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	236/1481	4.76	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	1	4	13	3	3.86	739/1246	3.70	3.88	3.93	3.78	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	1	7	6	5	3.41	1121/1411	3.53	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.41
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	8	4	9	3.91	1025/1413	3.54	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	2	3	4	12	4.09	946/1408	3.90	4.28	4.27	4.03	4.09
4. Were special techniques successful	7	20	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	10	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	16						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	26
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 102 0301
 Title AMER HIST SINCE 1877
 Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 890
 JAN 19, 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	2	4	18	4.67	352/1556	4.53	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	356/1557	4.55	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	223/1335	4.61	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	747/1510	4.43	4.19	4.19	4.07	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	7	4	12	4.13	652/1479	4.00	4.18	3.97	3.90	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/1424	3.94	4.05	4.08	3.91	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	233/1537	4.54	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	2	0	13	9	0	3.21	1543/1553	4.54	4.62	4.69	4.66	3.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	225/1536	4.47	4.24	4.07	3.91	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	16	4.50	816/1487	4.76	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	942/1491	4.86	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	19	4.67	389/1489	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	21	4.79	267/1481	4.76	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	7	9	6	3.87	733/1246	3.70	3.88	3.93	3.78	3.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	586/1411	3.53	3.90	4.00	3.78	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	3	0	3	3	7	3.69	1121/1413	3.54	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	618/1408	3.90	4.28	4.27	4.03	4.47
4. Were special techniques successful	7	13	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 103 0101
 Title EAST-ASIAN CIVILIZATIO
 Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 49

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 892
 JAN 19, 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	0	2	9	34	4.55	476/1556	4.55	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	14	27	4.38	686/1557	4.38	4.23	4.21	4.13	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	5	11	29	4.40	627/1335	4.40	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	31	3	0	3	4	6	3.63	1289/1510	3.63	4.19	4.19	4.07	3.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	10	10	20	3.85	903/1479	3.85	4.18	3.97	3.90	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	33	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	954/1424	3.86	4.05	4.08	3.91	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	3	42	4.83	135/1537	4.83	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	3	9	34	4.67	991/1553	4.67	4.62	4.69	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	2	4	16	15	4.19	735/1536	4.19	4.24	4.07	3.91	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	4	41	4.79	370/1487	4.79	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	4	41	4.81	763/1491	4.81	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	9	33	4.53	558/1489	4.53	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	1	6	37	4.62	487/1481	4.62	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	4	9	13	17	4.00	600/1246	4.00	3.88	3.93	3.78	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	31	0	3	0	4	5	6	3.61	1019/1411	3.61	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.61
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	32	0	2	1	2	5	7	3.82	1065/1413	3.82	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	1	1	4	4	7	3.88	1082/1408	3.88	4.28	4.27	4.03	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	32	12	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	25	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	17
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	7	C	4	General	7	Under-grad	49	Non-major	32
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	1	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	3						

Title

Baltimore County

JAN 19, 2005

Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE

Fall 2004

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 9

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	3	5	4.44	635/1556	4.44	4.45	4.25	4.06	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1212/1557	3.89	4.23	4.21	4.13	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	569/1335	4.44	4.36	4.24	4.13	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	2	3.67	1269/1510	3.67	4.19	4.19	4.07	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	0	3.22	1284/1479	3.22	4.18	3.97	3.90	3.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	2	3	0	3.00	1345/1424	3.00	4.05	4.08	3.91	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	692/1537	4.33	4.24	4.15	4.12	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1000/1553	4.67	4.62	4.69	4.66	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	787/1536	4.13	4.24	4.07	3.91	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	390/1487	4.78	4.60	4.44	4.37	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	816/1491	4.78	4.84	4.70	4.61	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	683/1489	4.44	4.43	4.27	4.18	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	291/1481	4.78	4.51	4.28	4.18	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	802/1246	3.75	3.88	3.93	3.78	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1155/1411	3.33	3.90	4.00	3.78	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1246/1413	3.33	4.19	4.23	3.96	3.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	981/1408	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.03	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 200 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY WORLD
 Instructor: COHEN, WARREN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 95
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 894
 JAN 19, 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	4	8	17	22	4.12	1035/1556	4.12	4.45	4.25	4.33	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	12	19	16	3.90	1198/1557	3.90	4.23	4.21	4.30	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	10	17	20	4.00	958/1335	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	15	16	16	3.98	1021/1510	3.98	4.19	4.19	4.23	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	7	10	14	16	3.61	1099/1479	3.61	4.18	3.97	3.88	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	3	13	16	13	3.74	1047/1424	3.74	4.05	4.08	4.04	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	6	5	10	11	19	3.63	1275/1537	3.63	4.24	4.15	4.17	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	1	49	4.94	408/1553	4.94	4.62	4.69	4.69	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	1	6	14	23	4.27	647/1536	4.17	4.24	4.07	4.13	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	7	40	4.71	526/1487	4.70	4.60	4.44	4.47	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	4	5	42	4.75	870/1491	4.79	4.84	4.70	4.75	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	12	33	4.54	545/1489	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	9	38	4.61	500/1481	4.59	4.51	4.28	4.37	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	5	0	9	9	15	3.76	795/1246	4.09	3.88	3.93	4.02	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	10	4	5	7	6	2.84	1317/1411	2.84	3.90	4.00	4.05	2.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	7	5	7	6	6	2.97	1333/1413	2.97	4.19	4.23	4.28	2.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	6	0	6	9	10	3.55	1206/1408	3.55	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	22	28	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	3.92	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	3.60	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	3.97	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	3.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.01	4.07	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.18	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	6
			Required for Majors	10	Graduate
				0	Major
					14

28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	31
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	8
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	12	D	2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	0

General	8
Electives	1
Other	29

Under-grad	53	Non-major	39
------------	----	-----------	----

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 200 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY WORLD
 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 95
 Questionnaires: 53

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 895
 JAN 19, 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	4	8	17	22	4.12	1035/1556	4.12	4.45	4.25	4.33	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	3	12	19	16	3.90	1198/1557	3.90	4.23	4.21	4.30	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	2	2	10	17	20	4.00	958/1335	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.37	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	15	16	16	3.98	1021/1510	3.98	4.19	4.19	4.23	3.98
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	7	10	14	16	3.61	1099/1479	3.61	4.18	3.97	3.88	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	3	13	16	13	3.74	1047/1424	3.74	4.05	4.08	4.04	3.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	6	5	10	11	19	3.63	1275/1537	3.63	4.24	4.15	4.17	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	1	49	4.94	408/1553	4.94	4.62	4.69	4.69	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	1	8	17	13	4.08	823/1536	4.17	4.24	4.07	4.13	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	543/1487	4.70	4.60	4.44	4.47	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	1	5	34	4.82	713/1491	4.79	4.84	4.70	4.75	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	1	5	9	25	4.45	683/1489	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.49
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	2	4	3	31	4.57	541/1481	4.59	4.51	4.28	4.37	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	14	0	1	0	6	7	25	4.41	328/1246	4.09	3.88	3.93	4.02	4.09
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	10	4	5	7	6	2.84	1317/1411	2.84	3.90	4.00	4.05	2.84
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	7	5	7	6	6	2.97	1333/1413	2.97	4.19	4.23	4.28	2.97
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	6	0	6	9	10	3.55	1206/1408	3.55	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.55
4. Were special techniques successful	22	28	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	3.92	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	51	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	4.32	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	3.60	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	50	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	3.97	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	3.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.01	4.07	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	51	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.18	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	1	A	6
			Required for Majors	10	Graduate
				0	Major
					14

28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	31
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	4	C	8
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	12	D	2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0
				P	1
				I	0
				?	0

General	8
Electives	1
Other	29

Under-grad	53	Non-major	39
------------	----	-----------	----

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: HIST 201 0101
 Title INTRO TO STUDY OF HIST
 Instructor: RITSCHER, DANIE
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 896
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	3	6	9	6	3.64	1352/1556	3.64	4.45	4.25	4.33	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	11	7	3.96	1118/1557	3.96	4.23	4.21	4.30	3.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	23	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1335	****	4.36	4.24	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	8	6	9	3.96	1046/1510	3.96	4.19	4.19	4.23	3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	3	10	10	4.12	652/1479	4.12	4.18	3.97	3.88	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	7	8	9	4.08	751/1424	4.08	4.05	4.08	4.04	4.08
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	9	12	4.28	746/1537	4.28	4.24	4.15	4.17	4.28
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	340/1553	4.96	4.62	4.69	4.69	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	8	9	3	3.75	1136/1536	3.75	4.24	4.07	4.13	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	3	2	18	4.54	769/1487	4.54	4.60	4.44	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	955/1491	4.70	4.84	4.70	4.75	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	991/1489	4.17	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	4	10	7	3.96	1115/1481	3.96	4.51	4.28	4.37	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	2	3	7	7	2	3.19	1073/1246	3.19	3.88	3.93	4.02	3.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	4	3	7	6	3.75	937/1411	3.75	3.90	4.00	4.05	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	6	10	4.25	797/1413	4.25	4.19	4.23	4.28	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	790/1408	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.31	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	476/ 856	3.92	3.72	4.00	3.92	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	19
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	27	Non-major	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 273 0101
 Title HIST OF JEWS:MODRN TIM
 Instructor: SHIMOFF, SANDRA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 897
 JAN 19, 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	1	4	3	8	3.94	1179/1556	3.94	4.45	4.25	4.33	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	3	3	6	3.47	1390/1557	3.47	4.23	4.21	4.30	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	5	3	2	6	3.41	1193/1335	3.41	4.36	4.24	4.37	3.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	8	2	1	1	2	3	3.33	1397/1510	3.33	4.19	4.19	4.23	3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	4	2	8	3.82	928/1479	3.82	4.18	3.97	3.88	3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1316/1424	3.20	4.05	4.08	4.04	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	2	2	8	3.71	1229/1537	3.71	4.24	4.15	4.17	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	1237/1553	4.35	4.62	4.69	4.69	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	1	4	3	3	3.14	1423/1536	3.14	4.24	4.07	4.13	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	3	2	4	8	4.00	1231/1487	4.00	4.60	4.44	4.47	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	1162/1491	4.53	4.84	4.70	4.75	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	4	1	7	3.47	1327/1489	3.47	4.43	4.27	4.32	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	8	3.88	1169/1481	3.88	4.51	4.28	4.37	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	2	5	5	2	3.06	1108/1246	3.06	3.88	3.93	4.02	3.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	1	3	6	3.64	1001/1411	3.64	3.90	4.00	4.05	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	923/1413	4.07	4.19	4.23	4.28	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1173/1408	3.64	4.28	4.27	4.31	3.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	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	7				
				?	3						

Course-Section: HIST 303 0101
 Title SECOND WORLD WAR
 Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON
 Enrollment: 112
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 898
 JAN 19, 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	3	1	10	52	4.68	331/1556	4.68	4.45	4.25	4.27	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	15	46	4.62	356/1557	4.62	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	15	50	4.74	232/1335	4.74	4.36	4.24	4.21	4.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	2	1	4	19	38	4.41	576/1510	4.41	4.19	4.19	4.20	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	5	17	38	4.24	533/1479	4.24	4.18	3.97	3.95	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	10	15	38	4.35	505/1424	4.35	4.05	4.08	4.08	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	5	15	44	4.53	442/1537	4.53	4.24	4.15	4.13	4.53
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	63	4.98	136/1553	4.98	4.62	4.69	4.67	4.98
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	0	1	15	37	4.68	207/1536	4.68	4.24	4.07	4.07	4.68
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	63	4.95	91/1487	4.95	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	64	4.95	257/1491	4.95	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	56	4.85	195/1489	4.85	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	61	4.89	170/1481	4.89	4.51	4.28	4.25	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	2	0	6	15	42	4.46	284/1246	4.46	3.88	3.93	3.98	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	35	0	9	2	6	4	11	3.19	1226/1411	3.19	3.90	4.00	3.98	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	36	0	4	3	4	5	15	3.77	1087/1413	3.77	4.19	4.23	4.23	3.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	36	0	3	5	3	7	13	3.71	1150/1408	3.71	4.28	4.27	4.28	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	37	22	0	2	1	0	5	4.00	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	3.99	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	63	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.07	4.03	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	64	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.36	4.41	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 238	****	****	4.26	4.28	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.08	4.09	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	64	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.14	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	64	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	3.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.02	4.03	3.52	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	4.16	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	65	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	4.19	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	3.81	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	3.72	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	65	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	4.11	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	****	4.01	4.57	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.18	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.36	3.76	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	64	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.87	****

Course-Section: HIST 303 0101
 Title SECOND WORLD WAR
 Instructor: LAURIE, CLAYTON
 Enrollment: 112
 Questionnaires: 67

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 898
 JAN 19, 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	24	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	0	B	32						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	18	C	6	General	34	Under-grad	67	Non-major	49
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	15	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HIST 323 0101
 Title AFRO-AMER WOMENS HISTO
 Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 899
 JAN 19, 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	2	12	4.86	174/1556	4.86	4.45	4.25	4.27	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	97/1557	4.93	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.21	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.19	4.19	4.20	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	74/1479	4.93	4.18	3.97	3.95	4.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	166/1424	4.71	4.05	4.08	4.08	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	0	12	4.77	181/1537	4.77	4.24	4.15	4.13	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	867/1553	4.79	4.62	4.69	4.67	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	72/1536	4.92	4.24	4.07	4.07	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.60	4.44	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.27	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.51	4.28	4.25	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1246	5.00	3.88	3.93	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	127/1411	4.90	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	198/1413	4.90	4.19	4.23	4.23	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	247/ 856	4.44	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.44

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 355B 0101
 Title HIST OF EAST ASIAN REL
 Instructor: INGEMAN, LARA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 900
 JAN 19, 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	3	4	11	4.44	635/1556	4.44	4.45	4.25	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	603/1557	4.44	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	650/1335	4.39	4.36	4.24	4.21	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	10	4.17	847/1510	4.17	4.19	4.19	4.20	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	299/1479	4.50	4.18	3.97	3.95	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	10	4.22	629/1424	4.22	4.05	4.08	4.08	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	560/1537	4.44	4.24	4.15	4.13	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.62	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	2	6	6	4.00	868/1536	4.00	4.24	4.07	4.07	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	723/1487	4.59	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	834/1491	4.76	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	415/1489	4.65	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	610/1481	4.53	4.51	4.28	4.25	4.53
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	217/1246	4.56	3.88	3.93	3.98	4.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	711/1411	4.08	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	6	6	4.23	814/1413	4.23	4.19	4.23	4.23	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	6	5	4.15	901/1408	4.15	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	667/ 856	3.46	3.72	4.00	3.99	3.46

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	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	8	Under-grad	18	Non-major	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 361 0101
 Title THE FRENCH REVOLUTION
 Instructor: WEXLER, VICTOR
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 901
 JAN 19, 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	1	11	14	4.50	537/1556	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.27	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	8	10	3.92	1171/1557	3.92	4.23	4.21	4.21	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	13	4.15	875/1335	4.15	4.36	4.24	4.21	4.15
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	0	7	5	4.23	768/1510	4.23	4.19	4.19	4.20	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	8	7	11	4.12	662/1479	4.12	4.18	3.97	3.95	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	916/1424	3.91	4.05	4.08	4.08	3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	8	4	13	4.12	925/1537	4.12	4.24	4.15	4.13	4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	19	4	4.04	1437/1553	4.04	4.62	4.69	4.67	4.04
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	10	7	4.09	811/1536	4.09	4.24	4.07	4.07	4.09
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	4	8	13	4.36	995/1487	4.36	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	205/1491	4.96	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	4	6	11	3.92	1165/1489	3.92	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	6	12	4.16	982/1481	4.16	4.51	4.28	4.25	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	6	6	9	4.05	585/1246	4.05	3.88	3.93	3.98	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	5	5	9	4.00	739/1411	4.00	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	693/1413	4.38	4.19	4.23	4.23	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	568/1408	4.52	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.52
4. Were special techniques successful	5	16	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	3.99	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	4.17	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.14	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.02	4.03	3.52	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	4.16	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.82	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	1	Major	17
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	9	Under-grad	25	Non-major	9
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						

I	0	Other	9
?	1		

Course-Section: HIST 369 0101
 Title DARWINISM
 Instructor: HERBERT, SANDRA
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 902
 JAN 19, 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	2	8	6	4.06	1083/1556	4.06	4.45	4.25	4.27	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	2	1	5	6	3	3.41	1414/1557	3.41	4.23	4.21	4.21	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	11	4	4.12	909/1335	4.12	4.36	4.24	4.21	4.12
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	5	6	6	4.06	951/1510	4.06	4.19	4.19	4.20	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	7	5	3.71	1033/1479	3.71	4.18	3.97	3.95	3.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	8	7	1	3.47	1213/1424	3.47	4.05	4.08	4.08	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	3	4	6	3.75	1200/1537	3.75	4.24	4.15	4.13	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	9	5	2	3.56	1535/1553	3.56	4.62	4.69	4.67	3.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	4	6	2	3.57	1251/1536	3.57	4.24	4.07	4.07	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	1061/1487	4.29	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	563/1491	4.88	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	1069/1489	4.06	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1070/1481	4.00	4.51	4.28	4.25	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	3	4	8	1	3.29	1041/1246	3.29	3.88	3.93	3.98	3.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	907/1411	3.80	3.90	4.00	3.98	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	753/1413	4.30	4.19	4.23	4.23	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	790/1408	4.30	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	685/ 856	3.40	3.72	4.00	3.99	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	19	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 369H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: HERBERT, SANDRA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 903
 JAN 19, 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	2	4	4	4.20	955/1556	4.20	4.45	4.25	4.27	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	1	3.60	1346/1557	3.60	4.23	4.21	4.21	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	840/1335	4.20	4.36	4.24	4.21	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	984/1510	4.00	4.19	4.19	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	4	3.90	862/1479	3.90	4.18	3.97	3.95	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	1084/1424	3.70	4.05	4.08	4.08	3.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1111/1537	3.90	4.24	4.15	4.13	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	4	2	3.80	1518/1553	3.80	4.62	4.69	4.67	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	694/1536	4.22	4.24	4.07	4.07	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1289/1487	3.90	4.60	4.44	4.43	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1080/1491	4.60	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	1090/1489	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	773/1481	4.40	4.51	4.28	4.25	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	4	2	3.60	891/1246	3.60	3.88	3.93	3.98	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	207/1411	4.75	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	574/1413	4.50	4.19	4.23	4.23	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	584/1408	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	567/ 856	3.75	3.72	4.00	3.99	3.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	4.27	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.14	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	3.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	4.56	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.02	4.03	3.52	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 375 0101
 Title EUR WOMN HIST 1750-191
 Instructor: BOEHLING, REBEC
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 904
 JAN 19, 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	0	2	1	12	4.24	915/1556	4.24	4.45	4.25	4.27	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	7	4	3.65	1332/1557	3.65	4.23	4.21	4.21	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	9	4.18	857/1335	4.18	4.36	4.24	4.21	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	1	10	4.00	984/1510	4.00	4.19	4.19	4.20	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	9	3.94	811/1479	3.94	4.18	3.97	3.95	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	1	1	9	3.65	1127/1424	3.65	4.05	4.08	4.08	3.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	7	6	4.00	993/1537	4.00	4.24	4.15	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	891/1553	4.76	4.62	4.69	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	830/1536	4.06	4.24	4.07	4.07	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	0	3	10	4.06	1214/1487	4.06	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	15	4.75	852/1491	4.75	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	3	3	6	3.67	1277/1489	3.67	4.43	4.27	4.27	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	969/1481	4.19	4.51	4.28	4.25	4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	3	1	1	2	0	2.29	1214/1246	2.29	3.88	3.93	3.98	2.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	676/1411	4.13	3.90	4.00	3.98	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	2	10	4.33	730/1413	4.33	4.19	4.23	4.23	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	4	3	7	4.00	981/1408	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	1	1	5	6	4.00	414/ 856	4.00	3.72	4.00	3.99	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	3						

Course-Section: HIST 383 0101
 Title JAPAN IN SHOGUN AGE
 Instructor: VAPORIS, CONSTA
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 905
 JAN 19, 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	18	4.35	773/1556	4.35	4.45	4.25	4.27	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	8	16	4.23	874/1557	4.23	4.23	4.21	4.21	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	1	10	17	4.32	719/1335	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.21	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	12	14	4.19	811/1510	4.19	4.19	4.19	4.20	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	10	14	4.13	641/1479	4.13	4.18	3.97	3.95	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	11	6	11	3.87	946/1424	3.87	4.05	4.08	4.08	3.87
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	5	7	14	4.03	975/1537	4.03	4.24	4.15	4.13	4.03
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	22	7	4.24	1313/1553	4.24	4.62	4.69	4.67	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	3	5	18	1	3.63	1223/1536	3.63	4.24	4.07	4.07	3.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	7	20	4.53	781/1487	4.53	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	713/1491	4.83	4.84	4.70	4.69	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	11	15	4.20	962/1489	4.20	4.43	4.27	4.27	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	2	6	18	4.28	896/1481	4.28	4.51	4.28	4.25	4.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	0	3	7	17	4.17	519/1246	4.17	3.88	3.93	3.98	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	3	2	6	4	3.28	1185/1411	3.28	3.90	4.00	3.98	3.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	1	6	8	3.94	993/1413	3.94	4.19	4.23	4.23	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	2	0	7	8	4.06	962/1408	4.06	4.28	4.27	4.28	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	13	10	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	807/ 856	2.88	3.72	4.00	3.99	2.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	6	General	13	Under-grad	31	Non-major	23
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	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	11				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HIST 403 0101
 Title THE AMERICAN COLONIES
 Instructor: KARS, MARJOLEIN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 906
 JAN 19, 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	2	5	18	4.64	373/1556	4.64	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	662/1557	4.40	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	6	14	4.33	707/1335	4.33	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	8	11	4.08	932/1510	4.08	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	18	4.56	263/1479	4.56	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	4	7	9	3.79	1001/1424	3.79	4.05	4.08	4.18	3.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	659/1537	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	1056/1553	4.60	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	1	10	9	4.29	623/1536	4.29	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	630/1487	4.64	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	410/1491	4.92	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	493/1489	4.58	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	500/1481	4.60	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	585/1246	4.04	3.88	3.93	3.99	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	4	7	9	4.14	668/1411	4.14	3.90	4.00	4.14	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	0	4	16	4.62	499/1413	4.62	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	2	5	13	4.43	676/1408	4.43	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	2	2	6	5	4	3.37	698/ 856	3.37	3.72	4.00	4.20	3.37
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	3.71	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.36	3.87	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 238	****	****	4.26	4.06	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.08	3.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.73	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	4.73	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	4.03	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	4.76	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	4.41	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	3.46	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.01	3.29	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.18	4.25	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.36	5.00	****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students

24 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 16 **** **** 4.51 5.00 ****

Course-Section: HIST 403 0101
 Title THE AMERICAN COLONIES
 Instructor: KARS, MARJOLEIN
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 906
 JAN 19, 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	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	1	Major	19
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	1	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 407 0101
 Title FOUNDRING OF AMER NATIO
 Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 907
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	246/1556	4.77	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	1	1	1	5	18	4.46	573/1557	4.46	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	3	18	4.50	484/1335	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	5	4	17	4.46	484/1510	4.46	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	5	16	4.42	373/1479	4.42	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	6	6	14	4.31	553/1424	4.31	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	1	3	20	4.54	442/1537	4.54	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	1019/1553	4.64	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	8	16	4.52	341/1536	4.52	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.52
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	211/1487	4.88	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	0	4	20	4.72	326/1489	4.72	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	2	22	4.76	303/1481	4.76	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	2	5	16	4.46	293/1246	4.46	3.88	3.93	3.99	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	3	0	3	2	10	3.89	852/1411	3.89	3.90	4.00	4.14	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	1	1	1	14	4.44	637/1413	4.44	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	584/1408	4.50	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	11	14	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	4.20	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.73	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	4.73	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	4.77	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.02	4.03	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	2	Major	20
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	27	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 421 0101
 Title THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR
 Instructor: RUBIN, ANNE
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 908
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	321/1556	4.69	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	9	12	4.20	907/1557	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	1049/1335	3.87	4.36	4.24	4.31	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	10	12	4.28	715/1510	4.28	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.28
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	6	15	4.31	481/1479	4.31	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	1	12	9	3.96	850/1424	3.96	4.05	4.08	4.18	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	9	12	4.23	800/1537	4.23	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	20	5	4.15	1369/1553	4.15	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.15
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	0	0	12	8	4.24	682/1536	4.24	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	4	18	4.56	746/1487	4.56	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	410/1491	4.92	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	0	7	16	4.48	626/1489	4.48	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	3	20	4.60	500/1481	4.60	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	7	15	4.40	337/1246	4.40	3.88	3.93	3.99	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	2	9	10	4.27	572/1411	4.27	3.90	4.00	4.14	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	328/1413	4.77	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	308/1408	4.82	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	1	2	8	8	4.05	404/ 856	4.05	3.72	4.00	4.20	4.05

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	15
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	5	Under-grad	26	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	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	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 435 0101
 Title 20TH C US FOREIGN POLI
 Instructor: COHEN, WARREN
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 909
 JAN 19, 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	0	1	9	18	4.48	569/1556	4.48	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	10	12	4.07	1029/1557	4.07	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	8	16	4.32	719/1335	4.32	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.32
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	1	4	6	12	4.13	895/1510	4.13	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	7	14	4.14	641/1479	4.14	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	10	11	4.07	758/1424	4.07	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	5	6	2	16	4.00	993/1537	4.00	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	272/1553	4.97	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	508/1536	4.38	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	241/1487	4.86	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	359/1491	4.93	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	5	21	4.55	532/1489	4.55	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	21	4.62	475/1481	4.62	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	4	3	2	3	6	3.22	1063/1246	3.22	3.88	3.93	3.99	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	2	6	2	9	3.80	907/1411	3.80	3.90	4.00	4.14	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	1	4	12	4.20	848/1413	4.20	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	4	3	12	4.25	825/1408	4.25	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	9	16	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	1	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	28	Non-major	15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 445 0101
 Title HISTORY OF SCIENCE
 Instructor: TATAREWICZ, JOS
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 910
 JAN 19, 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	2	2	12	4.63	394/1556	4.63	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	434/1557	4.56	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	484/1335	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	304/1510	4.64	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	364/1479	4.44	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	218/1424	4.64	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	714/1537	4.31	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	728/1553	4.88	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	189/1536	4.69	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	429/1487	4.75	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	588/1491	4.88	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	558/1489	4.53	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	773/1481	4.40	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	337/1246	4.40	3.88	3.93	3.99	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	367/1411	4.50	3.90	4.00	4.14	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	353/1413	4.75	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	288/1408	4.83	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	587/ 856	3.71	3.72	4.00	4.20	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	16	Non-major	8
84-150	3	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	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 447 0101
 Title HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHT
 Instructor: SMEAD, HOWARD
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 911
 JAN 19, 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	1	5	21	4.74	268/1556	4.74	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	9	11	4.04	1047/1557	4.04	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	627/1335	4.41	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	984/1510	4.00	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	233/1479	4.62	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	2	3	6	11	3.92	905/1424	3.92	4.05	4.08	4.18	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	6	18	4.62	350/1537	4.62	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	5	21	0	3.81	1518/1553	3.81	4.62	4.69	4.71	3.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	10	8	4.30	600/1536	4.30	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.30
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	21	4.70	526/1487	4.70	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	563/1491	4.89	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	3	20	4.59	480/1489	4.59	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	20	4.74	327/1481	4.74	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	13	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	600/1246	4.00	3.88	3.93	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	3	4	3	6	4	3.20	1220/1411	3.20	3.90	4.00	4.14	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	2	2	4	2	10	3.80	1076/1413	3.80	4.19	4.23	4.43	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	1	2	1	14	4.20	868/1408	4.20	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	8	16	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	6	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	8	Under-grad	22	Non-major	21
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 453 0101
 Title ANCIENT GREECE
 Instructor: STORCH, RUDOLPH
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 912
 JAN 19, 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	1	4	5	29	4.50	537/1556	4.50	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	29	4.63	356/1557	4.63	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	7	26	4.43	598/1335	4.43	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	22	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	423/1510	4.50	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	11	8	20	4.15	621/1479	4.15	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	29	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	226/1424	4.64	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	6	32	4.79	155/1537	4.79	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	31	4.78	879/1553	4.78	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	8	22	4.58	296/1536	4.58	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	35	4.85	256/1487	4.85	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	39	4.97	154/1491	4.98	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	15	25	4.63	441/1489	4.63	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	35	4.85	208/1481	4.85	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	6	11	21	4.33	392/1246	4.33	3.88	3.93	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	3	4	4	4	3.29	1175/1411	3.29	3.90	4.00	4.14	3.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	0	5	3	8	4.00	947/1413	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	6	3	7	3.94	1037/1408	3.94	4.28	4.27	4.41	3.94
4. Were special techniques successful	24	14	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	4.20	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	3.71	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C 6	General	9	Under-grad	40	Non-major	22
84-150	20	3.00-3.49	14	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P 1						
				I 0	Other	24				
				? 0						

Course-Section: HIST 462 0101
 Title MEDIEVAL EUROPE
 Instructor: BIRKENMEIER, JO
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 913
 JAN 19, 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	24	4.45	635/1556	4.45	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	13	18	4.26	828/1557	4.26	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	10	24	4.53	461/1335	4.53	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	3	6	13	14	4.06	951/1510	4.06	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	7	6	6	18	3.87	895/1479	3.87	4.18	3.97	4.05	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	7	8	19	4.14	711/1424	4.14	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	7	8	18	4.00	993/1537	4.00	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	37	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.62	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	5	16	12	4.15	770/1536	4.15	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	10	24	4.50	816/1487	4.50	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	36	4.95	308/1491	4.95	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	5	12	17	4.11	1049/1489	4.11	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	5	26	4.51	624/1481	4.51	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.51
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	4	6	8	20	4.16	526/1246	4.16	3.88	3.93	3.99	4.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	4	6	9	9	3.82	893/1411	3.82	3.90	4.00	4.14	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	2	5	19	4.46	616/1413	4.46	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	2	8	17	4.46	630/1408	4.46	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	3	1	1	5	10	3.90	492/ 856	3.90	3.72	4.00	4.20	3.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	17	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	2	Major	23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	11	Under-grad	36	Non-major	15
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	24				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HIST 470 0101
 Title TUDOR & STUART ENGLAND
 Instructor: FROIDE, AMY
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 914
 JAN 19, 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	2	6	22	4.67	352/1556	4.67	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	17	4.47	573/1557	4.47	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	4	9	15	4.31	730/1335	4.31	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	12	12	4.17	847/1510	4.17	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	4	21	4.40	392/1479	4.40	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	8	16	4.27	591/1424	4.27	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.27
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	7	7	14	4.10	936/1537	4.10	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	272/1553	4.97	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	14	12	4.31	588/1536	4.31	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	9	21	4.70	543/1487	4.70	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	7	23	4.77	834/1491	4.77	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	19	4.60	467/1489	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	23	4.67	425/1481	4.67	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	1	2	5	8	9	3.88	722/1246	3.88	3.88	3.93	3.99	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	3	10	9	4.00	739/1411	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	3	2	18	4.54	548/1413	4.54	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	3	18	4.58	520/1408	4.58	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	7	18	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	20
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	19						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	30	Non-major	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	8	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	19				
				?	2						

Course-Section: HIST 477 0101
 Title HISTORY OF CHINA TO 16
 Instructor: YIP, KA-CHE
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 915
 JAN 19, 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	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	463/1556	4.56	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	332/1557	4.64	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	415/1335	4.56	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	269/1510	4.69	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	13	4.36	427/1479	4.36	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	9	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	203/1424	4.67	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	6	16	4.36	659/1537	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	4	3	18	4.56	1079/1553	4.56	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	460/1536	4.43	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	211/1487	4.88	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	205/1491	4.96	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	225/1489	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	255/1481	4.80	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	6	9	6	4.00	600/1246	4.00	3.88	3.93	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	3	1	2	5	5	3.50	1065/1411	3.50	3.90	4.00	4.14	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	2	5	8	4.06	930/1413	4.06	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	839/1408	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	****/ 856	****	3.72	4.00	4.20	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	16
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	6	Under-grad	22	Non-major	9
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 483 0101
 Title GERM HIST: 1789 TO 191
 Instructor: BOEHLING, REBEC
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 916
 JAN 19, 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	4	2	14	4.33	802/1556	4.33	4.45	4.25	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	8	6	3.71	1308/1557	3.71	4.23	4.21	4.27	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	1	4	11	3.90	1034/1335	3.90	4.36	4.24	4.31	3.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	4	4	9	3.85	1143/1510	3.85	4.19	4.19	4.26	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	8	4	5	3.38	1231/1479	3.38	4.18	3.97	4.05	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	8	5	4	3.38	1256/1424	3.38	4.05	4.08	4.18	3.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	0	6	9	3.76	1194/1537	3.76	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	340/1553	4.95	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	3	1	11	5	3.76	1127/1536	3.76	4.24	4.07	4.20	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	2	1	14	4.10	1205/1487	4.10	4.60	4.44	4.52	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	257/1491	4.95	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	3	2	11	3.76	1238/1489	3.76	4.43	4.27	4.32	3.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	2	12	4.05	1050/1481	4.05	4.51	4.28	4.38	4.05
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	2	3	4	1	0	2.40	1202/1246	2.40	3.88	3.93	3.99	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	3	8	4.00	739/1411	4.00	3.90	4.00	4.14	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	5	0	9	4.00	947/1413	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	2	4	0	9	3.88	1085/1408	3.88	4.28	4.27	4.41	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	476/ 856	3.93	3.72	4.00	4.20	3.93
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	4.83	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.73	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	4.73	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	4.77	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 101	****	4.02	4.03	4.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	4	Major	10
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	11
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D	1						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	1						

Course-Section: HIST 493 0101
 Title COLLOQUIUM EUROPEAN HI
 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 917
 JAN 19, 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	5	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	380/1557	4.60	4.23	4.21	4.27	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	157/1510	4.80	4.19	4.19	4.26	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	299/1479	4.50	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	145/1424	4.75	4.05	4.08	4.18	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	285/1537	4.67	4.24	4.15	4.22	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.62	4.69	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.24	4.07	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.60	4.44	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.51	4.28	4.38	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1411	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	290/1413	4.80	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	216/ 856	4.50	3.72	4.00	4.20	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	80/ 102	4.00	4.63	4.50	4.83	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	69/ 101	4.33	4.76	4.39	4.73	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	62/ 90	4.00	4.75	4.36	4.73	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	50/ 98	4.67	4.92	4.49	4.77	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	80/ 101	3.33	4.02	4.03	4.33	3.33
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	4.76	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	4.75	****

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	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	5	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 495 0101
 Title COLLOQUIUM: AMER HISTO
 Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 918
 JAN 19, 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	0	1	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1557	5.00	4.23	4.21	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1510	5.00	4.19	4.19	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1479	5.00	4.18	3.97	4.05	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.05	4.08	4.18	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1537	5.00	4.24	4.15	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1453/1553	4.00	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.24	4.07	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.60	4.44	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.51	4.28	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1246	5.00	3.88	3.93	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.19	4.23	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.28	4.27	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	3.72	4.00	4.20	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 496 0101
 Title HISTORICAL RESEARCH
 Instructor: BOUTON, TERRY
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 919
 JAN 19, 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	3	6	3	3.53	1390/1556	3.53	4.45	4.25	4.39	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	4	3.67	1326/1557	3.67	4.23	4.21	4.27	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1335	****	4.36	4.24	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	8	0	5	3.64	1279/1510	3.64	4.19	4.19	4.26	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1253/1479	3.33	4.18	3.97	4.05	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	3	4	3.69	1091/1424	3.69	4.05	4.08	4.18	3.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	5	3	5	3.86	1141/1537	3.86	4.24	4.15	4.22	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	1331/1553	4.21	4.62	4.69	4.71	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	659/1536	4.25	4.24	4.07	4.20	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	6	2	3.77	1333/1487	3.77	4.60	4.44	4.52	3.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	1328/1491	4.29	4.84	4.70	4.79	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	5	2	2	3.00	1423/1489	3.00	4.43	4.27	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	1	3	3.08	1399/1481	3.08	4.51	4.28	4.38	3.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	9	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1246	****	3.88	3.93	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	4	3	3.60	1025/1411	3.60	3.90	4.00	4.14	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	426/1413	4.70	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	981/1408	4.00	4.28	4.27	4.41	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	542/ 856	3.80	3.72	4.00	4.20	3.80
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	3.71	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	9	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	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 701 0101
 Title STUDY OF HISTORY
 Instructor: KARS, MARJOLEIN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 920
 JAN 19, 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	3	14	4.82	192/1556	4.82	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	6	3.88	1212/1557	3.88	4.23	4.21	4.23	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	958/1335	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.31	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	4	9	4.19	823/1510	4.19	4.19	4.19	4.27	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	251/1479	4.59	4.18	3.97	4.23	4.59
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	444/1424	4.41	4.05	4.08	4.34	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	4	4	4	3.18	1428/1537	3.18	4.24	4.15	4.17	3.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.62	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	823/1536	4.07	4.24	4.07	4.17	4.07
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	487/1487	4.73	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	513/1491	4.91	4.84	4.70	4.78	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	741/1489	4.40	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	351/1481	4.73	4.51	4.28	4.28	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	4	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1114/1246	3.00	3.88	3.93	3.95	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	89/1411	4.93	3.90	4.00	4.29	4.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	138/1413	4.93	4.19	4.23	4.52	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	451/1408	4.67	4.28	4.27	4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	1	1	1	4	2	3.56	643/ 856	3.56	3.72	4.00	4.16	3.56
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 102	5.00	4.63	4.50	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	48/ 101	4.70	4.76	4.39	4.65	4.70
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.75	4.36	4.63	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.92	4.49	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	63/ 101	3.90	4.02	4.03	4.04	3.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	16				
				?	0						

Course-Section: HIST 710 0101
 Title COLLOQ:POL HIST
 Instructor: BROWN, KATHRYN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 921
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	186/1556	4.83	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	907/1557	4.20	4.23	4.21	4.23	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	658/1510	4.33	4.19	4.19	4.27	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	118/1479	4.83	4.18	3.97	4.23	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	203/1424	4.67	4.05	4.08	4.34	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	843/1537	4.20	4.24	4.15	4.17	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.62	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	486/1536	4.40	4.24	4.07	4.17	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	816/1487	4.50	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	598/1489	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	913/1481	4.25	4.51	4.28	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	600/1246	4.00	3.88	3.93	3.95	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	260/1411	4.67	3.90	4.00	4.29	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.19	4.23	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	288/1408	4.83	4.28	4.27	4.55	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	414/ 856	4.00	3.72	4.00	4.16	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 102	5.00	4.63	4.50	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.76	4.39	4.65	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.75	4.36	4.63	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.92	4.49	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	51/ 101	4.33	4.02	4.03	4.04	4.33

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 713 0101
 Title COLLOQ: SOCIAL HIST
 Instructor: SCOTT, MICHELLE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 922
 JAN 19, 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	4	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	840/1557	4.25	4.23	4.21	4.23	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	747/1510	4.25	4.19	4.19	4.27	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	299/1479	4.50	4.18	3.97	4.23	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	145/1424	4.75	4.05	4.08	4.34	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	476/1537	4.50	4.24	4.15	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1114/1553	4.50	4.62	4.69	4.78	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	659/1536	4.25	4.24	4.07	4.17	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	816/1487	4.50	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	281/1489	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	913/1481	4.25	4.51	4.28	4.28	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	249/1246	4.50	3.88	3.93	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	586/1411	4.25	3.90	4.00	4.29	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.19	4.23	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	367/1408	4.75	4.28	4.27	4.55	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	414/ 856	4.00	3.72	4.00	4.16	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: HIST 716 0101
 Title COLLOQ: HISTORIOGRAPH
 Instructor: LANMAN, BARRY
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 923
 JAN 19, 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	8	5.00	1/1556	5.00	4.45	4.25	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	356/1557	4.63	4.23	4.21	4.23	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1335	****	4.36	4.24	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	423/1510	4.50	4.19	4.19	4.27	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	155/1479	4.75	4.18	3.97	4.23	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	234/1424	4.63	4.05	4.08	4.34	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	190/1537	4.75	4.24	4.15	4.17	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	728/1553	4.88	4.62	4.69	4.78	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	99/1536	4.88	4.24	4.07	4.17	4.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	734/1487	4.57	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	326/1489	4.71	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	541/1481	4.57	4.51	4.28	4.28	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	319/1246	4.43	3.88	3.93	3.95	4.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	229/1411	4.71	3.90	4.00	4.29	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	244/1413	4.86	4.19	4.23	4.52	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	267/1408	4.86	4.28	4.27	4.55	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	360/ 856	4.20	3.72	4.00	4.16	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	67/ 102	4.50	4.63	4.50	4.71	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	4.76	4.39	4.65	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.75	4.36	4.63	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.92	4.49	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	36/ 101	4.50	4.02	4.03	4.04	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	4.30	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	4.18	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	4.35	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	4.58	****

Frequency Distribution

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

I 0
? 1

Other

4

Course-Section: HIST 801 0101
 Title POLICY HISTORY
 Instructor: JEFFRIES, JOHN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 924
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	129/1556	4.92	4.45	4.25	4.36	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	215/1557	4.75	4.23	4.21	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.31	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	98/1510	4.92	4.19	4.19	4.27	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1479	5.00	4.18	3.97	4.23	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	89/1424	4.91	4.05	4.08	4.34	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	936/1537	4.10	4.24	4.15	4.17	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	794/1553	4.83	4.62	4.69	4.78	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1536	5.00	4.24	4.07	4.17	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	316/1487	4.82	4.60	4.44	4.43	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.84	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.51	4.28	4.28	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1246	****	3.88	3.93	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1411	5.00	3.90	4.00	4.29	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1413	5.00	4.19	4.23	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	194/1408	4.92	4.28	4.27	4.55	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 856	5.00	3.72	4.00	4.16	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 102	****	4.63	4.50	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.76	4.39	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 90	****	4.75	4.36	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.92	4.49	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.02	4.03	4.04	****

Frequency Distribution

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