

Course-Section: ART 210 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 105
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	9	4.60	508/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	199/1639	4.42	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	282/1397	4.63	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1583	4.69	4.50	4.19	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	335/1532	3.83	3.99	4.01	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1504	3.13	3.89	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	490/1612	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1635	4.45	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.35	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.77	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	4.92	4.87	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	351/1550	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1295	4.81	4.50	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1398	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1391	4.55	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	577/ 958	4.16	4.13	3.93	4.00	3.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	4.33	4.60	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	4.67	3.87	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 210 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 105
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 106
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1003/1639	4.42	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1397	4.63	4.50	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	323/1583	4.69	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	3	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.83	3.99	4.01	4.09	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	1	2	2.89	1437/1504	3.13	3.89	4.05	4.09	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1190/1612	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	1447/1635	4.45	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	496/1579	4.35	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	242/1518	4.77	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.92	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	886/1517	4.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	897/1550	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	329/1295	4.81	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	477/1398	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	839/1391	4.55	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	702/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 958	4.16	4.13	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	115/ 240	4.33	4.60	4.11	4.47	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 53	4.67	3.87	4.05	4.28	4.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 210 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 106
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 210 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 107
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	17	4.52	604/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	7	15	4.33	774/1639	4.42	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	17	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1397	4.63	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	9	14	4.38	625/1583	4.69	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	774/1532	3.83	3.99	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	3	3	7	5	6	3.33	1303/1504	3.13	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	6	7	13	4.27	802/1612	4.22	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	25	0	3.96	1525/1635	4.45	4.63	4.65	4.63	3.96	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	806/1579	4.35	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	7	17	4.60	684/1518	4.77	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	437/1520	4.92	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	8	16	4.60	474/1517	4.61	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	0	8	15	4.36	805/1550	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	103/1295	4.81	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	386/1398	4.54	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	332/1391	4.55	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	375/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	260/ 958	4.16	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.42	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 11		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 108
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	214/1639	4.70	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	252/1639	4.69	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	334/1397	4.85	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	239/1583	4.85	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	3	6	5	12	4.00	774/1532	3.84	3.99	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	3	0	5	4	2	12	3.91	932/1504	3.74	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	418/1612	4.44	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	16	10	4.38	1250/1635	4.54	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	197/1579	4.46	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	20	4.70	548/1518	4.84	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	219/1520	4.97	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	22	4.74	311/1517	4.78	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	0	7	18	4.48	664/1550	4.53	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.48	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	185/1295	4.50	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	260/1398	4.63	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	489/1391	4.68	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	201/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	0	4	2	10	4.38	284/ 958	4.09	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.38	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	21/ 224	4.88	4.96	4.10	4.33	4.88	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	25/ 240	4.88	4.60	4.11	4.47	4.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	39/ 219	4.88	2.29	4.44	4.61	4.88	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	2	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	31/ 52	4.33	4.67	4.04	4.78	4.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	23/ 53	4.44	3.87	4.05	4.28	4.44	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	34/ 50	4.38	4.79	4.45	3.24	4.38	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 211 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 108
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	11
84-150	0	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	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 211 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 109
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	508/1639	4.70	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	684/1639	4.69	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	175/1397	4.85	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	299/1583	4.85	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	911/1532	3.84	3.99	4.01	4.09	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	2	2	3.30	1323/1504	3.74	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	976/1612	4.44	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	855/1635	4.54	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	527/1579	4.46	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.38	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.84	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.97	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	275/1517	4.78	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	580/1550	4.53	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	577/1295	4.50	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.10	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	651/1398	4.63	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	662/1391	4.68	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	702/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	806/ 958	4.09	4.13	3.93	4.00	3.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 211 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SAAH, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 110
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	482/1639	4.70	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	252/1639	4.69	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	4.85	4.50	4.28	4.39	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1583	4.85	4.50	4.19	4.28	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	1	3	3.38	1312/1532	3.84	3.99	4.01	4.09	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1116/1504	3.74	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	490/1612	4.44	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1428/1635	4.54	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	889/1579	4.46	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.84	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	4.97	4.87	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	181/1517	4.78	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	638/1550	4.53	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1295	4.50	4.50	3.94	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	189/1398	4.63	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	441/1391	4.68	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	435/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	307/ 958	4.09	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	4.88	4.96	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.88	4.60	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	4.88	2.29	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	4.33	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	4.44	3.87	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	4.38	4.79	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 211 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SAAH, CHRIS
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 110
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 211 0501
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS II/CAM
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 111
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	342/1639	4.70	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	156/1639	4.69	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	230/1397	4.85	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	100/1583	4.85	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	6	4.07	729/1532	3.84	3.99	4.01	4.09	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	791/1504	3.74	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	388/1612	4.44	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	721/1635	4.54	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	175/1579	4.46	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1518	4.84	4.47	4.43	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1520	4.97	4.87	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	323/1517	4.78	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	522/1550	4.53	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	489/1295	4.50	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.63	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.68	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	267/ 958	4.09	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	4.88	4.96	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.88	4.60	4.11	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 112
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	6	1	3.46	1510/1639	3.86	4.45	4.27	4.35	3.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	4	2	2	4	3.31	1542/1639	3.78	4.38	4.22	4.27	3.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	1219/1583	4.00	4.50	4.19	4.28	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1046/1532	3.58	3.99	4.01	4.09	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	3	2	1	2.73	1465/1504	2.72	3.89	4.05	4.09	2.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	5	2	3.54	1387/1612	3.47	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	529/1635	4.90	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	2	4	4	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.58	4.26	4.08	4.14	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	4.08	1213/1518	4.26	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	10	4.62	1101/1520	4.78	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	3	3	3.46	1361/1517	4.09	4.43	4.27	4.34	3.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1318/1550	3.96	4.24	4.22	4.33	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	623/1295	4.11	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	987/1398	3.86	4.27	4.07	4.14	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	321/1391	4.50	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	0	3	6	4.18	877/1388	4.42	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.18	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	4	1	1	3.50	725/ 958	3.54	4.13	3.93	4.00	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0201
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: SHIFLET, NICOLE
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 113
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	951/1639	3.86	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1014/1639	3.78	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	741/1583	4.00	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1532	3.58	3.99	4.01	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1424/1612	3.47	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	4.90	4.63	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	889/1579	3.58	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	561/1518	4.26	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	4.78	4.87	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	239/1517	4.09	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	522/1550	3.96	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	221/1295	4.11	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	426/1398	3.86	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	4.50	4.52	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1388	4.42	4.56	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	456/ 958	3.54	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.28	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	

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
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Major 0
				P 0	Non-major 0
Electives 0					
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

I	0	Other	10
?	0		

Course-Section: ART 212 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: SHEFFIELD, SAM
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 114
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	814/1639	3.86	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	774/1639	3.78	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	8	4.20	852/1583	4.00	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	8	3	3.79	1012/1532	3.58	3.99	4.01	4.09	3.79	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	5	3	2	3.33	1303/1504	2.72	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	7	4	2	3.33	1455/1612	3.47	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	1001/1635	4.90	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	601/1579	3.58	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	170/1518	4.26	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.78	4.87	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	462/1517	4.09	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	603/1550	3.96	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	12	4.69	167/1295	4.11	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	660/1398	3.86	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	356/1391	4.50	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	435/1388	4.42	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	307/ 958	3.54	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 212 0401
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS III/3D
 Instructor: YOUNG, SHANNON
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 115
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	4	1	3	3	3.45	1513/1639	3.86	4.45	4.27	4.35	3.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	1	3.36	1530/1639	3.78	4.38	4.22	4.27	3.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1324/1583	4.00	4.50	4.19	4.28	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1378/1532	3.58	3.99	4.01	4.09	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	0	2	1	1	2.10	1493/1504	2.72	3.89	4.05	4.09	2.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1383/1612	3.47	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	4.90	4.63	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	4	2	0	3.00	1477/1579	3.58	4.26	4.08	4.14	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1449/1518	4.26	4.47	4.43	4.48	3.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1188/1520	4.78	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1347/1517	4.09	4.43	4.27	4.34	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	1	1	3.17	1419/1550	3.96	4.24	4.22	4.33	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	1	0	2	2	3.14	1138/1295	4.11	4.50	3.94	4.07	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1271/1398	3.86	4.27	4.07	4.14	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1247/1391	4.50	4.52	4.30	4.35	3.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1078/1388	4.42	4.56	4.28	4.37	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	931/ 958	3.54	4.13	3.93	4.00	2.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0101
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: MOREN, LISA
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 116
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	12	12	4.44	698/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	13	8	4.12	992/1639	4.30	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	22	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	1	0	14	9	4.29	751/1583	4.34	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	9	2	1	3	6	3	3.47	1264/1532	3.66	3.99	4.01	4.09	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	16	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1340/1504	3.25	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	2	2	7	8	5	3.50	1399/1612	3.58	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	706/1635	4.88	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	15	5	4.04	865/1579	4.32	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	1	11	10	4.26	1085/1518	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	491/1520	4.94	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	5	12	6	4.04	1059/1517	4.32	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	6	4	10	3.87	1182/1550	4.27	4.24	4.22	4.33	3.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	1	1	0	7	12	4.33	398/1295	4.59	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	851/1398	4.13	4.27	4.07	4.14	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	816/1391	4.44	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	712/1388	4.63	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	544/ 958	4.12	4.13	3.93	4.00	3.88	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	3.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 213 0301
 Title VISUAL CONCEPTS IV/4D
 Instructor: NOHE, TIM
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 117
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	561/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	18	4.48	550/1639	4.30	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	625/1583	4.34	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	2	0	5	5	8	3.85	950/1532	3.66	3.99	4.01	4.09	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	21	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	****/1504	3.25	3.89	4.05	4.09	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	9	9	6	3.65	1332/1612	3.58	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	3	23	4.88	691/1635	4.88	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	292/1579	4.32	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	472/1518	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	219/1520	4.94	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	9	17	4.59	486/1517	4.32	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	457/1550	4.27	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	98/1295	4.59	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	5	12	4.32	574/1398	4.13	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.32	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	2	18	4.64	516/1391	4.44	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	19	4.82	317/1388	4.63	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	11	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	290/ 958	4.12	4.13	3.93	4.00	4.36	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.47	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	14
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	6
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	1
				General	0
				Electives	0
				Other	21
				Graduate	0
				Under-grad	27
				Major	22
				Non-major	5
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: ART 214 0101
 Title DRAWING I
 Instructor: GARDNER, SYMMES
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 118
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	712/1639	4.44	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	393/1639	4.63	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	2	4	3	3.38	1308/1532	3.38	3.99	4.01	4.09	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	1135/1612	3.93	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	3	4.19	1402/1635	4.19	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	548/1579	4.36	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	968/1518	4.38	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	699/1520	4.85	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	560/1517	4.54	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	787/1550	4.38	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	864/1295	3.71	4.50	3.94	4.07	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	0	3	8	4.31	582/1398	4.31	4.27	4.07	4.14	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	950/1391	4.08	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	892/1388	4.15	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.15	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	10	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	3.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 215 0101
 Title INTRO TO ART & MEDIA
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 138
 Questionnaires: 92

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 119
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	5	5	14	24	43	4.04	1110/1639	4.04	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	9	16	22	42	3.99	1124/1639	3.99	4.38	4.22	4.27	3.99	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	69	0	3	3	3	13	4.18	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	17	3	3	19	16	34	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	15	1	5	11	18	40	4.21	616/1532	4.21	3.99	4.01	4.09	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	6	11	21	48	4.22	647/1504	4.22	3.89	4.05	4.09	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	2	7	12	22	46	4.16	924/1612	4.16	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	3	0	1	0	10	77	4.85	736/1635	4.85	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	5	2	2	12	29	25	4.04	865/1579	4.04	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.04	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	5	16	68	4.65	629/1518	4.65	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	6	8	77	4.75	890/1520	4.75	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	7	15	66	4.57	510/1517	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	11	13	61	4.41	755/1550	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	1	5	9	69	4.65	191/1295	4.65	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	7	4	16	16	35	3.87	899/1398	3.87	4.27	4.07	4.14	3.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	4	4	13	8	47	4.18	871/1391	4.18	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	2	1	3	15	55	4.58	593/1388	4.58	4.56	4.28	4.37	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	60	3	1	1	2	10	3.88	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	4.00	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	91	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	91	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	91	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	91	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	91	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	89	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	91	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	10	0.00-0.99	1	A	41	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	62
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	1	B	34						
56-83	15	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	91	Non-major	30
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	14	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	77				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 110
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 120
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	1	4	7	17	32	4.23	919/1639	4.23	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	16	37	4.40	684/1639	4.40	4.38	4.22	4.27	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	3	1	13	44	4.61	417/1397	4.61	4.50	4.28	4.39	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	5	1	3	6	27	20	4.09	953/1583	4.09	4.50	4.19	4.28	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	2	3	8	18	25	4.09	714/1532	4.09	3.99	4.01	4.09	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	8	13	24	15	3.68	1110/1504	3.68	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	9	17	35	4.39	656/1612	4.39	4.05	4.16	4.21	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	0	2	58	4.92	595/1635	4.92	4.63	4.65	4.63	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	3	0	0	9	24	14	4.11	830/1579	4.11	4.26	4.08	4.14	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	13	43	4.62	656/1518	4.62	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	3	55	4.92	491/1520	4.92	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	6	22	31	4.38	747/1517	4.38	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	2	2	12	45	4.64	489/1550	4.64	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	2	2	8	44	4.68	179/1295	4.68	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	7	5	5	14	12	3.44	1139/1398	3.44	4.27	4.07	4.14	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	2	1	7	15	18	4.07	954/1391	4.07	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.07	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	19	0	1	4	10	12	17	3.91	1035/1388	3.91	4.56	4.28	4.37	3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	26	4	4	3	3	3	2.82	886/ 958	2.82	4.13	3.93	4.00	2.82	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	4	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	57	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	57	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	57	2	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	57	2	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	57	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	57	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	58	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	58	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	58	3	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	58	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	58	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	57	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	57	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	57	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	57	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 220 0101
 Title ART HISTORY I
 Instructor: FELDMAN, JOAN
 Enrollment: 110
 Questionnaires: 63

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 120
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	3	A	36	Required for Majors	21	Graduate	0	Major	27
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	6	Under-grad	63	Non-major	36
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	14	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 117
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 121
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	2	13	22	26	4.00	1138/1639	4.00	4.45	4.27	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	15	25	20	3.86	1287/1639	3.86	4.38	4.22	4.27	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	11	22	26	3.97	1018/1397	3.97	4.50	4.28	4.39	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	4	14	18	24	3.98	1039/1583	3.98	4.50	4.19	4.28	3.98	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	10	18	32	4.15	663/1532	4.15	3.99	4.01	4.09	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	6	5	16	15	20	3.61	1147/1504	3.61	3.89	4.05	4.09	3.61	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	9	15	24	16	3.69	1310/1612	3.69	4.05	4.16	4.21	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	9	9	8	19	19	3.47	1604/1635	3.47	4.63	4.65	4.63	3.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	2	1	2	11	32	8	3.81	1125/1579	3.81	4.26	4.08	4.14	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	4	28	31	4.34	1021/1518	4.34	4.47	4.43	4.48	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	6	56	4.79	837/1520	4.79	4.87	4.70	4.78	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	13	25	25	4.11	1025/1517	4.11	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.11	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	5	12	42	4.41	769/1550	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	4.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	8	10	41	4.42	337/1295	4.42	4.50	3.94	4.07	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	17	4	10	5	11	2.77	1329/1398	2.77	4.27	4.07	4.14	2.77	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	15	7	15	6	3	2.46	1379/1391	2.46	4.52	4.30	4.35	2.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	14	9	11	5	6	2.56	1370/1388	2.56	4.56	4.28	4.37	2.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	41	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	56	9	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	59	0	4	1	2	0	0	1.71	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	58	6	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	58	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	58	7	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	58	6	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	59	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	59	3	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	59	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	59	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	59	0	4	0	1	0	2	2.43	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	59	0	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.28	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	59	5	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	60	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	60	0	1	0	2	2	1	3.33	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	60	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	59	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	60	4	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	61	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 221 0101
 Title ART HISTORY II
 Instructor: OTTESEN, BODIL
 Enrollment: 117
 Questionnaires: 66

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 121
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	4	A	21	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	1	Major	28
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	23						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	5	C	14	General	7	Under-grad	65	Non-major	38
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	36				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ART 305 0101
 Title FILM I: MOVING IMAGES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 122
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	154/1639	4.92	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	822/1397	4.22	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	536/1583	4.45	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	568/1504	4.30	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	449/1612	4.55	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.55	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	332/1579	4.56	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	643/1518	4.64	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	439/1517	4.64	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	388/1550	4.73	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	82/1295	4.91	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	599/1398	4.29	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1388	4.71	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	682/ 958	3.60	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 315 0101
 Title VIDEO I
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 123
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.45	4.27	4.28	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	992/1639	4.13	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1195/1397	3.71	4.50	4.28	4.26	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1312/1532	3.38	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1212/1504	3.50	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	1279/1612	3.75	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	973/1517	4.17	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	265/1295	4.50	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	887/1388	4.17	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.67	4.04	4.78	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	49/ 53	2.50	3.87	4.05	4.31	2.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.63	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.52	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	17/ 32	4.50	4.50	4.56	4.30	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 320 0101
 Title INTRO TO PRINTMAKING
 Instructor: BOWLER, RUTH S
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 124
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	561/1639	4.56	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1410/1639	3.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1268/1397	3.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	3	4	3.89	1171/1583	3.89	4.50	4.19	4.24	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	1	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	701/1504	4.17	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	1	1	2.78	1561/1612	2.78	4.05	4.16	4.12	2.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1284/1579	3.57	4.26	4.08	4.07	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	5	1	3.50	1419/1518	3.50	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1151/1520	4.56	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	2	3	2	3.33	1405/1517	3.33	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	2	3.33	1385/1550	3.33	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1101/1295	3.25	4.50	3.94	3.95	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	721/1398	4.13	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	546/1388	4.63	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 323 0101
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: FAGAN, JASON
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 125
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	13	21	4.43	712/1639	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	13	21	4.49	550/1639	4.58	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.49	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	15	21	4.54	477/1397	4.69	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	2	5	1	8	14	3.90	1158/1583	4.31	4.50	4.19	4.24	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	10	23	4.43	409/1532	4.18	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	8	8	15	4.00	824/1504	4.15	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	11	21	4.43	589/1612	4.53	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	33	4.89	676/1635	4.93	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	1	5	15	11	3.94	989/1579	4.21	4.26	4.08	4.07	3.94	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	27	4.69	561/1518	4.81	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	34	4.92	491/1520	4.96	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	6	25	4.56	535/1517	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	7	26	4.64	489/1550	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	119/1295	4.81	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.79	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	5	1	4	2	11	3.57	1086/1398	3.93	4.27	4.07	4.13	3.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	1	2	2	16	4.26	808/1391	4.53	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.26	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	1	0	1	3	18	4.61	571/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	19	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	****/ 958	4.14	4.13	3.93	3.97	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	35	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 21
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B 13			
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	2	C 7	General 5	Under-grad 37	Non-major 16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 29		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 323 0102
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 126
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	5	23	4.67	430/1639	4.55	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	349/1639	4.58	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	25	4.83	209/1397	4.69	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	281/1583	4.31	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	6	14	3.93	869/1532	4.18	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	6	17	4.30	568/1504	4.15	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	6	22	4.63	352/1612	4.53	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	265/1635	4.93	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	1	1	5	12	4.47	416/1579	4.21	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	28	4.93	149/1518	4.81	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1520	4.96	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	27	4.90	157/1517	4.73	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	24	4.76	351/1550	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	100/1295	4.81	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	6	2	15	4.29	590/1398	3.93	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	344/1391	4.53	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	286/1388	4.72	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	2	4	5	11	4.14	418/ 958	4.14	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	29	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 323 0102
 Title 20TH CENTURY ART
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 126
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	17
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	2	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	29	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	23				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ART 324 0101
 Title HISTORY OF FILM TO 196
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 127
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	5	2	8	11	3.85	1289/1639	3.85	4.45	4.27	4.28	3.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	7	3	7	9	3.59	1447/1639	3.59	4.38	4.22	4.20	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	6	14	4.15	897/1397	4.15	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	19	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1261/1583	3.75	4.50	4.19	4.24	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	8	12	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	16	2	1	2	4	1	3.10	1392/1504	3.10	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	1	2	9	11	4.04	1016/1612	4.04	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	16	10	4.38	1250/1635	4.38	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	2	6	12	3	3.70	1214/1579	3.70	4.26	4.08	4.07	3.70	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	5	17	4.42	919/1518	4.42	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.42	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	3	20	4.65	1047/1520	4.65	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	2	8	12	4.04	1065/1517	4.04	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	2	8	12	3.96	1110/1550	3.96	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	1	4	19	4.64	197/1295	4.64	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	4	1	2	2	3	2.92	1308/1398	2.92	4.27	4.07	4.13	2.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	3	2	2	2	3	3.00	1321/1391	3.00	4.52	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	4	2	1	2	4	3.00	1320/1388	3.00	4.56	4.28	4.34	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 326 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: STEPHANY, JAROM
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 128
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	5	17	4.48	642/1639	4.48	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	2	15	4.04	1059/1639	4.04	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.04	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	1	2	18	4.42	646/1397	4.42	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	2	18	4.57	413/1583	4.57	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	366/1532	4.48	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	1	2	19	4.54	336/1504	4.54	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	6	13	4.12	955/1612	4.12	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	0	3	4	12	4.30	601/1579	4.30	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	2	19	4.54	757/1518	4.54	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	491/1520	4.92	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	3	18	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	1	20	4.70	424/1550	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	2	19	4.65	191/1295	4.65	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	3	0	1	0	9	3.92	863/1398	3.92	4.27	4.07	4.13	3.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	2	0	2	3	6	3.85	1100/1391	3.85	4.52	4.30	4.35	3.85	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	3	2	7	4.08	925/1388	4.08	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.08	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	5	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	185/ 958	4.57	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.57	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.44	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 326 0101
 Title HIST. OF PHOTOGRAPHY I
 Instructor: STEPHANY, JAROM
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 128
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	7	Under-grad	25	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 331 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: APOSTOLIDES, HE
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 129
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	656/1639	4.04	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	435/1639	3.96	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	181/1583	3.97	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	12	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	633/1532	3.89	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	14	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	10	4.24	837/1612	3.54	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	11	5	4.24	1366/1635	4.40	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	783/1579	3.89	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	863/1518	3.96	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	1188/1520	4.53	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	451/1517	4.17	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	2	10	4.06	1053/1550	3.76	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	167/1295	4.12	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	177/1398	4.24	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	321/1391	3.91	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	157/1388	4.17	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	9	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	185/ 958	4.04	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.57	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 17	Non-major 4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 13		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ART 331 0201
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN I
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 130
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	3	5	6	3.61	1447/1639	4.04	4.45	4.27	4.28	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	5	6	3	3.33	1536/1639	3.96	4.38	4.22	4.20	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	4	1	3	3	4	3.13	1513/1583	3.97	4.50	4.19	4.24	3.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	2	1	2	2	3.57	1201/1532	3.89	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	4	3	3	2	3	2	2.85	1554/1612	3.54	4.05	4.16	4.12	2.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	1101/1635	4.40	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	2	1	7	1	3.64	1251/1579	3.89	4.26	4.08	4.07	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	2	7	4	3.44	1432/1518	3.96	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	2	0	15	4.56	1151/1520	4.53	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	3	3	3	7	3.71	1280/1517	4.17	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	4	6	4	3.47	1340/1550	3.76	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	963/1295	4.12	4.50	3.94	3.95	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	4	5	4	3.60	1074/1398	4.24	4.27	4.07	4.13	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	4	4	2	3	3.00	1321/1391	3.91	4.52	4.30	4.35	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	3	6	3	3	3.40	1226/1388	4.17	4.56	4.28	4.34	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	9	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	725/ 958	4.04	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 4
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Other 16

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 131
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	430/1639	4.54	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	517/1639	4.43	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	239/1583	4.70	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	655/1532	4.17	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	945/1504	3.90	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	617/1612	4.31	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1350/1635	4.26	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.13	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	757/1518	4.19	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	4.92	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	768/1517	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	638/1550	3.27	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	185/1295	4.28	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	477/1398	4.46	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1388	4.87	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	399/ 958	3.98	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.17	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 131
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 132
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	430/1639	4.54	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	517/1639	4.43	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	239/1583	4.70	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	655/1532	4.17	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	945/1504	3.90	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	617/1612	4.31	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1350/1635	4.26	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.25	
Lecture															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	3	0	1	0	2.50	1491/1550	3.27	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	477/1398	4.46	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1388	4.87	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	399/ 958	3.98	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.17	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 132
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 133
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	430/1639	4.54	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	517/1639	4.43	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	239/1583	4.70	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	655/1532	4.17	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	945/1504	3.90	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	617/1612	4.31	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1350/1635	4.26	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.25	
Lecture															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	2	0	4	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	3.27	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	477/1398	4.46	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	244/1388	4.87	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	399/ 958	3.98	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.17	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: ART 332 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 133
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ART 332 0102
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN II
 Instructor: CUSTEN, CALVIN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 134
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	1003/1639	4.54	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	877/1639	4.43	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	444/1583	4.70	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	10	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/1504	3.90	3.89	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1044/1612	4.31	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1311/1635	4.26	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	889/1579	4.13	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1341/1518	4.19	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	725/1520	4.92	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	1172/1517	4.14	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1038/1550	3.27	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	731/1295	4.28	4.50	3.94	3.95	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	426/1398	4.46	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.89	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	317/1388	4.87	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	769/ 958	3.98	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.40	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 333 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN III
 Instructor: CAMPBELL, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 135
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	342/1639	4.73	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	241/1639	4.77	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	4	20	4.72	323/1397	4.72	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	207/1583	4.78	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	5	18	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	4	6	14	4.42	617/1612	4.42	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	14	4.56	1094/1635	4.56	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	12	9	4.30	601/1579	4.30	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.30	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	360/1517	4.71	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	20	4.75	351/1550	4.75	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	16	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	368/1295	4.38	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	1	2	4	10	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	471/1391	4.68	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	631/1388	4.53	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	5	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	107/ 958	4.79	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.79	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 22	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 24
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 26 Non-major 2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 22	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 334 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN IV
 Instructor: ABRAHAM, GUENET
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 136
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	4	5	4	16	4.10	1068/1639	4.10	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	9	6	13	4.07	1044/1639	4.07	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.07	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	25	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	7	15	4.24	802/1583	4.24	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	24	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/1532	****	3.99	4.01	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	7	5	3	0	3	2.28	1490/1504	2.28	3.89	4.05	4.12	2.28	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	4	5	7	6	3	4	2.76	1563/1612	2.76	4.05	4.16	4.12	2.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	3	6	2	12	4	3.30	1607/1635	3.30	4.63	4.65	4.66	3.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	5	9	10	4.21	714/1579	4.21	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	10	9	7	3.81	1347/1518	3.81	4.47	4.43	4.39	3.81	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	25	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	1	9	9	8	3.89	1193/1517	3.89	4.43	4.27	4.23	3.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	5	6	13	4.07	1043/1550	4.07	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	8	2	2	1	4	8	3.82	791/1295	3.82	4.50	3.94	3.95	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	6	5	15	4.14	708/1398	4.14	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	3	6	18	4.46	647/1391	4.46	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	2	3	6	17	4.36	771/1388	4.36	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	16	1	2	3	1	5	3.58	690/ 958	3.58	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.58	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.63	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	15	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	21
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	10
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	3						

Course-Section: ART 335 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN V
 Instructor: FAGAN, JASON
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 137
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	1	0	10	14	15	4.05	1103/1639	4.05	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.05	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	2	6	10	22	4.30	813/1639	4.30	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	3	5	9	23	4.30	749/1397	4.30	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	12	0	4	5	8	10	3.89	1171/1583	3.89	4.50	4.19	4.24	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	2	3	9	25	4.46	377/1532	4.46	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	4	2	7	10	6	10	3.43	1249/1504	3.43	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	1	1	2	9	26	4.49	518/1612	4.49	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.49	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	9	29	4.76	869/1635	4.76	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	3	11	14	7	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	4.26	4.08	4.07	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	4	12	22	4.41	933/1518	4.41	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	3	11	25	4.47	1213/1520	4.48	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	6	11	20	4.18	964/1517	4.18	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	2	1	2	5	9	22	4.26	897/1550	4.26	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.26	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	0	1	7	4	24	4.42	337/1295	4.42	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	6	4	5	3	7	3.04	1266/1398	3.04	4.27	4.07	4.13	3.04	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	3	5	6	11	3.88	1076/1391	3.88	4.52	4.30	4.35	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	1	2	7	5	11	3.88	1043/1388	3.88	4.56	4.28	4.34	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	25	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 37
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 0	Under-grad 44 Non-major 7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 38	
			? 5		

Course-Section: ART 341 0101
 Title INTRO TO ANIMATION
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 138
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	19	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	10	12	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	1	6	15	4.48	512/1583	4.48	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	6	5	8	3.73	1081/1532	3.73	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	20	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	756/1612	4.30	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	840/1635	4.78	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	10	7	4.20	725/1579	4.20	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	7	13	4.35	1010/1518	4.35	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.35	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	750/1520	4.83	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	523/1517	4.57	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	15	4.57	568/1550	4.57	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	0	3	19	4.63	209/1295	4.63	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	828/1398	3.95	4.27	4.07	4.13	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	441/1391	4.71	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	328/1388	4.81	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	8	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	278/ 958	4.38	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 16	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 1
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	21
			? 1		

Course-Section: ART 342 0101
 Title FILM/VIDEO THEORY & CR
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 139
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	171/1639	4.90	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	199/1639	4.80	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	162/1397	4.90	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	299/1583	4.70	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1532	5.00	3.99	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	222/1504	4.70	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	662/1635	4.90	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.26	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	174/1550	4.90	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	309/1398	4.70	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.90	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 346 0101
 Title VIDEO II
 Instructor: GRABILL, VIN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 140
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	3	5	2	3.73	1378/1639	3.73	4.45	4.27	4.28	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	840/1639	4.27	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1195/1397	3.71	4.50	4.28	4.26	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	5	2	1	0	1	2	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	945/1504	3.90	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	976/1612	4.10	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1635	4.73	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	691/1579	4.22	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	947/1517	4.20	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	944/1550	4.20	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	167/1295	4.70	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	1	4	3.60	1074/1398	3.60	4.27	4.07	4.13	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1388	4.70	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	2	0	0	1	1	2.75	895/ 958	2.75	4.13	3.93	3.97	2.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 350 0101
 Title CONSTRUCTED ENVIRONMEN
 Instructor: DURANT, MARK
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 141
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	355/1583	4.63	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	1201/1532	3.57	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1399/1612	3.50	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	450/1579	4.44	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.89	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	457/1550	4.67	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	155/1295	4.71	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 351 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO
 Instructor: SILBERG, STEVEN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 142
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	981/1532	3.82	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	945/1504	3.91	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	681/1612	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1034/1635	4.64	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1518	4.64	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	498/1517	4.58	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	690/1550	3.23	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	569/1295	4.11	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	204/1391	4.92	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	563/ 958	3.83	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 351 0101
 Title BLACK & WHITE PHOTO
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 143
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	2	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	0	5	4	3.82	981/1532	3.82	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	945/1504	3.91	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	681/1612	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1034/1635	4.64	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.64	
Lecture															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	1	0	4	0	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	3.23	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.23	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	204/1391	4.92	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	563/ 958	3.83	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 353 0101
 Title COLOR PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 144
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	393/1639	4.63	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	5	4.25	580/1532	4.25	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	1	1	2	3.17	1371/1504	3.17	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	669/1612	4.38	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1045/1635	4.63	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.71	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	500/1550	4.63	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	135/1295	4.75	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	355/1398	4.63	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	525/1391	4.63	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	149/1639	4.88	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	640/1583	4.38	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1532	5.00	3.99	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	490/1612	4.50	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	459/1295	4.25	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	599/1398	4.29	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	719/1391	4.38	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.44	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.31	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 359 0101
 Title TOPICS IN PHOTOGRAPHY
 Instructor: THOMPSON, CALLA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 146
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1639	4.89	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1639	4.89	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	236/1532	4.67	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	275/1504	4.63	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1612	4.89	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.26	4.08	4.07	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.88	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	208/1550	4.88	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	172/1398	4.89	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.90	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	87/ 958	4.86	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 360 0101
 Title MIXED MEDIA BOOK ARTS
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 147
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	248/1639	4.82	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	735/1639	4.36	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	536/1583	4.45	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1378/1532	3.20	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	1	4	1	3.11	1388/1504	3.11	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1253/1612	3.80	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	4.09	1458/1635	4.09	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	818/1579	4.11	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	213/1518	4.90	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	474/1517	4.60	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	580/1550	4.56	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	185/1295	4.67	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	511/1398	4.40	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	411/ 958	4.14	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 382 0101
 Title INTERACTIVITY
 Instructor: CRAWFORD, BONNI
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 148
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	684/1639	4.40	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	441/1532	4.40	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	291/1504	4.60	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	388/1612	4.60	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	241/1579	4.67	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	745/1518	4.56	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.89	4.87	4.70	4.68	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	535/1517	4.56	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	832/1550	4.33	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	185/1295	4.67	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 384 0101
 Title COMPUTER ANIMATION
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 149
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	248/1639	4.82	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	840/1639	4.27	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	7	4.36	696/1397	4.36	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	654/1583	4.36	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1532	****	3.99	4.01	4.05	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	2	4	2	3.60	1154/1504	3.60	3.89	4.05	4.12	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	928/1635	4.73	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	269/1579	4.63	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	1053/1518	4.30	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	917/1517	4.22	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	424/1550	4.70	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	185/1295	4.67	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	477/1398	4.44	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	579/1391	4.56	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	702/1388	4.44	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	190/ 958	4.56	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.56	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 389 0101
 Title TOPICS IN COMPUTER ART
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 150
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	698/1639	4.44	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	774/1639	4.33	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	1349/1397	3.13	4.50	4.28	4.26	3.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.33	697/1583	4.33	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	3	1	3.33	1330/1532	3.33	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	4	2	1	3.25	1474/1612	3.25	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	473/1579	4.43	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	886/1517	4.25	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1228/1550	3.78	4.24	4.22	4.20	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	243/1295	4.56	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	929/1398	3.80	4.27	4.07	4.13	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 389C 0101
 Title SOUND DESIGN
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 151
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	2	4	4	3.83	1303/1639	3.83	4.45	4.27	4.28	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1330/1532	3.33	3.99	4.01	4.05	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	3	4	2	3.70	1305/1612	3.70	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1288/1635	4.33	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	755/1550	4.42	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	82/1295	4.91	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	675/1398	4.20	4.27	4.07	4.13	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1388	4.70	4.56	4.28	4.34	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	786/ 958	3.33	4.13	3.93	3.97	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 392 0101
 Title TOPICS IN ART OR MEDIA
 Instructor: ROSENBERG, JASO
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 152
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	6	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.20	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	774/1532	4.00	3.99	4.01	4.05	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1504	4.50	3.89	4.05	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	1497/1612	3.17	4.05	4.16	4.12	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.52	4.30	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.13	3.93	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 392C 0101
 Title INNOVATION AND DESIGN
 Instructor: YAGER, DAVID
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 153
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	0	3.33	1536/1639	3.33	4.38	4.22	4.20	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	186/1583	4.80	4.50	4.19	4.24	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.89	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1595/1612	2.00	4.05	4.16	4.12	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	1001/1635	4.67	4.63	4.65	4.66	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.26	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.47	4.43	4.39	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.43	4.27	4.23	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	288/1550	4.80	4.24	4.22	4.20	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	109/1295	4.80	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.13	3.93	3.97	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 423 0101
 Title ART SINCE 1945
 Instructor: JACOB, PREMINDA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 154
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	482/1639	4.63	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.50	4.28	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	640/1583	4.38	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	262/1532	4.63	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	612/1504	4.25	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1579	4.83	4.26	4.08	4.21	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.87	4.70	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	556/1550	4.57	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	95/1295	4.86	4.50	3.94	4.01	4.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	694/1391	4.40	4.52	4.30	4.48	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	571/1388	4.60	4.56	4.28	4.50	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 425 0101
 Title WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 155
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.50	4.28	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1504	4.50	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.26	4.08	4.21	4.50

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1550	3.50	4.24	4.22	4.24	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	265/1295	4.50	4.50	3.94	4.01	4.50

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 425 0101
 Title WRIT BY & ABOUT ARTIST
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 156
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.50	4.28	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	367/1504	4.50	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.07	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.48	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 430 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VI
 Instructor: RE, PEGGY
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 157
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	323/1583	4.67	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	6	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	655/1532	4.17	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	367/1504	4.50	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	681/1612	4.36	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.63	4.65	4.72	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	175/1579	4.75	4.26	4.08	4.21	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.87	4.70	4.75	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	371/1517	4.70	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	860/1550	4.30	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	221/1295	4.60	4.50	3.94	4.01	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	242/1398	4.78	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.52	4.30	4.48	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1388	4.70	4.56	4.28	4.50	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	240/ 958	4.44	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 431 0101
 Title GRAPHIC DESIGN VII
 Instructor: COATES, JOSEPH
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 158
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	2	2	3	4	1	3.00	1599/1639	3.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	6	1	1	2.83	1609/1639	2.83	4.38	4.22	4.29	2.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	1	0	3	4	1	3.44	1431/1583	3.44	4.50	4.19	4.31	3.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	11	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1532	****	3.99	4.01	4.07	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	3	3	2	1	0	2.11	1594/1612	2.11	4.05	4.16	4.18	2.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	3	4.25	1350/1635	4.25	4.63	4.65	4.72	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	4	5	1	1	2.75	1531/1579	2.75	4.26	4.08	4.21	2.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	2	4	1	0	2.18	1509/1518	2.18	4.47	4.43	4.51	2.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	5	3	3.75	1465/1520	3.75	4.87	4.70	4.75	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	2	5	1	0	2.36	1505/1517	2.36	4.43	4.27	4.34	2.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	5	1	0	2.17	1514/1550	2.17	4.24	4.22	4.24	2.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	2	3	2	1	2.64	1233/1295	2.64	4.50	3.94	4.01	2.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	3	3	0	2.55	1353/1398	2.55	4.27	4.07	4.23	2.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1208/1391	3.55	4.52	4.30	4.48	3.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1185/1388	3.50	4.56	4.28	4.50	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	9	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 435A 0101
 Title DOC. CINEMA IN 21ST CE
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 159
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	231/1639	4.78	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	151/1583	4.89	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	692/1532	4.11	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	182/1504	4.75	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.26	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	4.78	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	275/1517	4.78	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	325/1550	4.78	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	177/1398	4.88	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	255/1388	4.88	4.56	4.28	4.50	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	179/ 958	4.60	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.60	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	4.26	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	4.84	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.58	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.73	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.64	****	

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
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Non-major 5
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 2
					Other 6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 447 0201
 Title 2D ANIMATION/COMPOSITI
 Instructor: BELL, KATHRYN L
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 160
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	252/1639	4.75	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	850/1397	4.20	4.50	4.28	4.38	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	3.99	4.01	4.07	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	824/1504	4.00	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1279/1612	3.75	4.05	4.16	4.18	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1441/1635	4.13	4.63	4.65	4.72	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	6	1	3.88	1079/1579	3.88	4.26	4.08	4.21	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	1162/1518	4.17	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	725/1520	4.83	4.87	4.70	4.75	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	800/1517	4.33	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	638/1550	4.50	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1207/1398	3.25	4.27	4.07	4.23	3.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1220/1391	3.50	4.52	4.30	4.48	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.56	4.28	4.50	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	4.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	2	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		8
			I 0		Non-major
			? 0		1
					7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 484 0101
 Title ADVNCD 3D COMPUTER ANI
 Instructor: MCDONALD, NEAL
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 161
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	10	4.47	656/1639	4.47	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	1052/1639	4.06	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1138/1397	3.82	4.50	4.28	4.38	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	1	11	4.31	726/1583	4.31	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/1532	****	3.99	4.01	4.07	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	6	4	2	3.06	1401/1504	3.06	3.89	4.05	4.20	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	0	6	7	3.94	1122/1612	3.94	4.05	4.16	4.18	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	397/1635	4.94	4.63	4.65	4.72	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	6	3	3.85	1102/1579	3.85	4.26	4.08	4.21	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1196/1518	4.12	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	979/1520	4.71	4.87	4.70	4.75	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	964/1517	4.18	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	963/1550	4.18	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	229/1295	4.59	4.50	3.94	4.01	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	8	2	3.83	916/1398	3.83	4.27	4.07	4.23	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.52	4.30	4.48	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.50	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	424/ 958	4.13	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	17
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: ART 488 0101
 Title ADV TOPICS: ANIM/IN ME
 Instructor: BAILEY, DAN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 162
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	163/1639	4.86	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1532	****	3.99	4.01	4.07	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1504	****	3.89	4.05	4.20	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.71	4.26	4.08	4.21	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	4.01	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.52	4.30	4.48	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.13	3.93	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 489A 0101
 Title TIME-BASED MEDIA
 Instructor: DYER, ERIC G
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 163
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	0	4	3.50	1497/1639	3.50	4.45	4.27	4.42	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	0	5	3.63	1238/1397	3.63	4.50	4.28	4.38	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	155/1583	4.88	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1360/1532	3.25	3.99	4.01	4.07	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	291/1504	4.60	3.89	4.05	4.20	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	603/1612	4.43	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1257/1635	4.38	4.63	4.65	4.72	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	760/1579	4.17	4.26	4.08	4.21	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	529/1518	4.71	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	674/1520	4.86	4.87	4.70	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	854/1517	4.29	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	875/1550	4.29	4.24	4.22	4.24	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	265/1295	4.50	4.50	3.94	4.01	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	599/1398	4.29	4.27	4.07	4.23	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.52	4.30	4.48	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	276/1388	4.86	4.56	4.28	4.50	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	380/ 958	4.20	4.13	3.93	4.24	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 494 0103
 Title INTERNSHIP
 Instructor: COOK, CATHY
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 164
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.38	4.22	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.05	4.16	4.18	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.26	4.08	4.21	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.79	4.45	4.85	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.00	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.85	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	3.67	4.37	4.67	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 495 0125
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 165
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.29	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	4.50	3.99	4.01	4.07	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1519/1612	4.33	4.05	4.16	4.18	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.67	4.63	4.65	4.72	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	4.67	4.26	4.08	4.21	4.00	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.47	4.43	4.51	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	623/1295	4.00	4.50	3.94	4.01	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 495 0129
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: CHAN, IRENE Y.
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 166
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.29	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	4.33	4.05	4.16	4.18	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	4.67	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.67	4.26	4.08	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 495 0146
 Title INDEP STUDIO RESEARCH
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 167
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	4.67	4.38	4.22	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	4.50	3.99	4.01	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.89	4.05	4.20	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	4.33	4.05	4.16	4.18	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	4.67	4.63	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	4.67	4.26	4.08	4.21	5.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.07	4.23	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.50	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 610 0101
 Title IMAG. DIGITAL SEMINAR
 Instructor: BRADLEY, STEPHE
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 168
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1289/1639	3.86	4.45	4.27	4.42	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1367/1583	3.60	4.50	4.19	4.31	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	0	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.99	4.01	4.10	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1116/1504	3.67	3.89	4.05	4.29	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1360/1612	3.60	4.05	4.16	4.27	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	736/1635	4.86	4.63	4.65	4.81	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	1	0	3.25	1420/1579	3.25	4.26	4.08	4.17	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.47	4.43	4.49	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1376/1517	3.43	4.43	4.27	4.32	3.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	0	2	3.43	1360/1550	3.43	4.24	4.22	4.23	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	894/1295	3.67	4.50	3.94	3.95	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	4.27	4.07	4.22	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	752/1391	4.33	4.52	4.30	4.47	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.56	4.28	4.49	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	69/ 85	4.00	4.75	4.58	4.58	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	45/ 78	4.50	4.83	4.47	4.52	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	58/ 80	4.00	4.75	4.47	4.50	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.63	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	3	A	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	0	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	7	Non-major
					7

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ART 620 0101
 Title HIST I&D ARTS
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 169
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	177/1639	4.83	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.99	4.01	4.10	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	138/1504	4.83	3.89	4.05	4.29	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.05	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1579	4.80	4.26	4.08	4.17	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	315/1518	4.83	4.47	4.43	4.49	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	214/1517	4.83	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	529/1295	4.17	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	200/1398	4.83	4.27	4.07	4.22	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.75	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.37	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 638 0129
 Title TEACH PRACTICUM
 Instructor: PEREGOY, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 170
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.38	4.22	4.26	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	3.99	4.01	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.89	4.05	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.81	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	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	1/1550	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.49	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 640 0101
 Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 171
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	3.99	4.01	4.10	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	3.89	4.05	4.29	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.05	4.16	4.27	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.63	4.65	4.81	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	657/1579	4.25	4.26	4.08	4.17	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.47	4.43	4.49	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1237/1550	3.88	4.24	4.22	4.23	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	265/1295	4.50	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	625/1398	4.25	4.27	4.07	4.22	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.52	4.30	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	4.96	4.10	4.43	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	218/ 219	1.00	2.29	4.44	4.23	1.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.75	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.83	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.75	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.63	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	27/ 32	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.31	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 640 0101
 Title IMAGING & DIGITAL STUD
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 172
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.45	4.27	4.42	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.38	4.22	4.26	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	476/1583	4.50	4.50	4.19	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.75	3.99	4.01	4.10	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	3.89	4.05	4.29	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	814/1612	4.25	4.05	4.16	4.27	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.63	4.65	4.81	4.00	
Lecture															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1077/1550	3.88	4.24	4.22	4.23	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	625/1398	4.25	4.27	4.07	4.22	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.52	4.30	4.47	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.56	4.28	4.49	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	4.13	3.93	4.01	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 224	5.00	4.96	4.10	4.43	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	218/ 219	1.00	2.29	4.44	4.23	1.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.75	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.83	4.47	4.52	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.75	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	4.63	4.16	4.37	5.00	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	27/ 32	3.00	3.67	4.37	4.31	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 720A 0101
 Title WRTNG BY & ABOUT ARTIS
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 173
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.38	4.22	4.26	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.50	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1532	5.00	3.99	4.01	4.10	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	3.89	4.05	4.29	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.05	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.26	4.08	4.17	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.47	4.43	4.49	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.87	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.43	4.27	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.24	4.22	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	135/1295	4.75	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.07	4.22	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.47	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.56	4.28	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.13	3.93	4.01	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.23	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.74	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.75	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.75	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.63	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.67	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	3.87	4.05	4.03	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	5.00	4.75	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	5.00	4.58	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.50	4.56	4.59	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.79	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	5.00	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	5.00	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	3.67	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.42	****	

Course-Section: ART 720A 0101
 Title WRTNG BY & ABOUT ARTIS
 Instructor: MAHONEY, JAMES
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 173
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	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	5	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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: ART 740 0101
 Title ADV. I&D STUDIO
 Instructor: STURGEON, JOHN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 174
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1622/1639	2.80	4.45	4.27	4.42	2.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1444/1639	3.60	4.38	4.22	4.26	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1397	****	4.50	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1532/1583	3.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	633/1532	4.20	3.99	4.01	4.10	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1259/1504	3.40	3.89	4.05	4.29	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1399/1612	3.50	4.05	4.16	4.27	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1396/1635	4.20	4.63	4.65	4.81	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	1565/1579	2.33	4.26	4.08	4.17	2.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1141/1518	4.20	4.47	4.43	4.49	4.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1115/1520	4.60	4.87	4.70	4.79	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.43	4.27	4.32	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	944/1550	4.20	4.24	4.22	4.23	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	221/1295	4.60	4.50	3.94	3.95	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.27	4.07	4.22	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1192/1391	3.60	4.52	4.30	4.47	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.56	4.28	4.49	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.13	3.93	4.01	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 224	****	4.96	4.10	4.43	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.60	4.11	3.96	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	2.29	4.44	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.75	4.58	4.58	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.75	4.47	4.50	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	64/ 82	3.50	4.63	4.16	4.37	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ART 790 0126
 Title IND. STUDIES
 Instructor: WORDEN, FRED
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 175
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.45	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.38	4.22	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.50	4.19	4.31	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.05	4.16	4.27	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.63	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.26	4.08	4.17	5.00	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	4.50	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 50	5.00	4.79	4.45	4.39	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 32	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.50	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.61	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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