

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1203
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	0	0	1	0	4	9	15	4.28	818/1481	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.14	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	8	11	3.93	1082/1481	4.22	4.23	4.23	4.18	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	13	12	4.28	726/1249	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.28	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	0	10	5	4.19	818/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.06	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	3	3	8	14	4.18	574/1396	4.37	4.00	3.98	3.89	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	22	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	****/1342	4.13	4.10	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	8	15	4.32	707/1459	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	11	4.39	1120/1480	4.47	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	0	7	5	9	3.83	1038/1450	4.13	4.03	4.09	3.97	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	9	16	4.38	924/1409	4.56	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	682/1407	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	11	13	4.29	801/1399	4.42	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	8	12	3.83	1113/1400	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.19	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	2	5	7	14	4.07	570/1179	4.25	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	4	0	3	5	0	2.75	1196/1262	3.61	3.90	4.05	3.77	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	836/1259	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.06	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	0	2	2	7	4.17	826/1256	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.08	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	9	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 788	3.52	3.89	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 246	4.04	4.03	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 249	4.43	4.40	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 242	4.52	4.36	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 240	4.19	4.34	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 217	4.22	3.89	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	27	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	4.11	4.11	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	4.14	4.14	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	3.89	3.89	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	3.82	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	4.08	4.08	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0101
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1203
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	29	Non-major	28
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 154
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1204
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1	6	13	34	4.48	574/1481	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.14	4.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	6	17	32	4.47	560/1481	4.22	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	3	20	27	4.28	726/1249	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.28		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	20	0	1	6	11	17	4.26	740/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.06	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	1	1	4	10	35	4.51	297/1396	4.37	4.00	3.98	3.89	4.51	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	40	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	****/1342	4.13	4.10	4.07	3.88	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	3	7	12	32	4.35	671/1459	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	1	0	0	1	1	51	4.94	421/1480	4.47	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	2	0	6	27	13	4.02	825/1450	4.13	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.02	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	7	43	4.75	417/1409	4.56	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	4	6	44	4.74	842/1407	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	3	15	34	4.55	523/1399	4.42	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	4	13	34	4.49	602/1400	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.19	4.49	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	4	11	38	4.59	213/1179	4.25	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	27	0	3	3	4	6	15	3.87	816/1262	3.61	3.90	4.05	3.77	3.87	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	3	5	6	20	4.17	831/1259	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.06	4.17	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	1	3	5	23	4.45	625/1256	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.08	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	23	2	1	4	1	4	3.33	****/ 788	3.52	3.89	4.00	3.80	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	2	1	10	13	15	3.93	175/ 246	4.04	4.03	4.20	3.93	3.93	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	6	13	25	4.43	94/ 249	4.43	4.40	4.11	3.95	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	11	0	0	5	4	23	4.56	104/ 242	4.52	4.36	4.40	4.33	4.56	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	24	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	145/ 240	4.19	4.34	4.20	4.20	4.28	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	25	0	0	5	4	8	4.18	116/ 217	4.22	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.18	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	53	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	52	5	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.18	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	53	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	53	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	54	0	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	54	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	53	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	3	7	14	14	4.03	43/ 55	4.11	4.11	4.55	4.48	4.03	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	3	1	0	7	12	12	4.06	28/ 31	4.14	4.14	4.75	4.42	4.06	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	6	0	1	13	6	9	3.79	46/ 51	3.89	3.89	4.65	4.63	3.79	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	24	21	0	1	6	2	4	3.69	****/ 34	3.82	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	20	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	21/ 24	4.08	4.08	4.82	4.58	4.33	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0201
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 154
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1204
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	17	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	10	1.00-1.99	2	B	21						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	5	General	11	Under-grad	58	Non-major	56
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	12	D	1						
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	20				
				?	3						

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	9	29	61	4.53	531/1481	4.43	4.24	4.29	4.14	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	12	31	50	4.25	822/1481	4.22	4.23	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	24	27	43	4.09	857/1249	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.14	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	32	2	2	6	22	35	4.28	706/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.06	4.28	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	10	27	56	4.43	355/1396	4.37	4.00	3.98	3.89	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	59	0	3	6	12	17	4.13	660/1342	4.13	4.10	4.07	3.88	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	6	13	24	56	4.31	719/1459	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	1	5	77	15	4.08	1329/1480	4.47	4.69	4.68	4.64	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	43	55	4.53	311/1450	4.13	4.03	4.09	3.97	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	7	29	62	4.54	727/1409	4.56	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	3	6	89	4.88	568/1407	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.57	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	12	30	55	4.42	671/1399	4.42	4.28	4.26	4.23	4.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	3	12	23	58	4.38	729/1400	4.23	4.26	4.27	4.19	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	2	3	16	30	36	4.09	560/1179	4.25	3.95	3.96	3.85	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	33	0	2	0	11	23	31	4.21	603/1262	3.61	3.90	4.05	3.77	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	33	0	1	1	8	17	40	4.40	680/1259	4.25	4.24	4.29	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	33	0	1	0	7	15	44	4.51	571/1256	4.38	4.30	4.30	4.08	4.51	
4. Were special techniques successful	33	34	5	3	7	6	12	3.52	602/ 788	3.52	3.89	4.00	3.80	3.52	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	3	3	14	24	43	4.16	142/ 246	4.04	4.03	4.20	3.93	4.16	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	3	9	16	54	4.43	94/ 249	4.43	4.40	4.11	3.95	4.43	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	13	2	0	10	8	50	4.49	119/ 242	4.52	4.36	4.40	4.33	4.49	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	31	3	3	8	9	28	4.10	158/ 240	4.19	4.34	4.20	4.20	4.10	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	34	1	2	9	7	29	4.27	103/ 217	4.22	3.89	4.04	4.02	4.27	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	92	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	93	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	93	1	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	92	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	93	1	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	90	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	91	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	91	1	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	91	3	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	92	3	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	1	13	25	44	4.20	42/ 55	4.11	4.11	4.55	4.48	4.20	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	8	1	2	12	25	36	4.22	26/ 31	4.14	4.14	4.75	4.42	4.22	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	25	3	1	12	21	22	3.98	43/ 51	3.89	3.89	4.65	4.63	3.98	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	34	4	4	9	12	20	3.82	33/ 34	3.82	3.82	4.83	4.67	3.82	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	36	4	3	9	12	19	3.83	23/ 24	4.08	4.08	4.82	4.58	3.83	

Course-Section: PSYC 100 0401
 Title INTRO TO PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 141
 Questionnaires: 100

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1205
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	16	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	34	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	3	B	35						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	14	C	14	General	16	Under-grad	100	Non-major	99
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	4						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0101
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: KATENKAMP, ANGE
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1206
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	12	24	4.46	600/1481	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	12	28	4.66	336/1481	4.56	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	12	26	4.60	405/1249	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	4	10	20	4.47	473/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	5	4	2	6	11	12	3.71	950/1396	4.15	4.00	3.98	3.94	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	0	9	7	18	4.08	707/1342	4.04	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	9	28	4.54	425/1459	4.64	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	36	4.90	702/1480	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	15	16	4.38	494/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	483/1409	4.79	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	33	4.82	682/1407	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	9	29	4.72	311/1399	4.66	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	31	4.77	299/1400	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	3	7	28	4.59	218/1179	4.55	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	2	2	6	9	4.16	638/1262	3.84	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.16	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	7	3	9	4.11	867/1259	4.01	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	0	5	4	10	4.26	766/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.26	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	9	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	****/ 788	3.54	3.89	4.00	3.98	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	0	A	29	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	2	General	9	Under-grad	42	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0201
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1207
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	8	27	4.56	496/1481	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	13	24	4.61	399/1481	4.56	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	5	11	22	4.38	639/1249	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	21	1	2	1	7	7	3.94	1035/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.28	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	7	28	4.63	217/1396	4.15	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	31	1	0	3	0	4	3.75	****/1342	4.04	4.10	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	7	30	4.69	242/1459	4.64	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	4	33	4.84	784/1480	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.84	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	21	10	4.21	683/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.21	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	7	30	4.76	400/1409	4.79	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	33	4.84	636/1407	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.84	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	8	27	4.63	417/1399	4.66	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	8	25	4.53	571/1400	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	7	29	4.76	134/1179	4.55	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.76	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	10	3	10	3.80	862/1262	3.84	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	2	1	3	7	12	4.04	883/1259	4.01	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.04	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	4	2	18	4.48	592/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	12	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	598/ 788	3.54	3.89	4.00	3.98	3.54	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	8	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 0 Major 8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 7	C 7	General 4	Under-grad 41 Non-major 33
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 200 0301
 Title CHILD DEVELOPMENTAL PS
 Instructor: BEVANS, KATHERI
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1208
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	6	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	639/1481	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	646/1481	4.56	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	0	1	2	6	8	4.24	757/1249	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.24	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	1	0	1	2	4	9	4.31	671/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	8	6	4.12	633/1396	4.15	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	2	9	4	4.00	755/1342	4.04	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	231/1459	4.64	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1230/1480	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	651/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	231/1409	4.79	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	823/1407	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	431/1399	4.66	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	468/1400	4.64	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	397/1179	4.55	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	4	1	3	3.56	976/1262	3.84	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	0	2	5	3.89	987/1259	4.01	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	357/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	****/ 788	3.54	3.89	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	1	1	7	13	8	3.87	1187/1481	4.19	4.24	4.29	4.40	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	6	10	13	4.17	909/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	11	16	4.33	679/1249	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	9	2	2	3	6	8	3.76	1181/1424	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.28	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	3	12	11	3.97	744/1396	3.75	4.00	3.98	3.94	3.97	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	11	0	1	7	4	7	3.89	891/1342	3.89	4.10	4.07	4.05	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	6	7	15	4.13	881/1459	4.48	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1480	4.70	4.69	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	2	6	9	6	3.83	1038/1450	4.12	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	8	20	4.52	750/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	30	4.97	200/1407	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	2	5	15	8	3.87	1110/1399	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.29	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	6	7	14	4.00	1017/1400	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	10	6	11	3.83	739/1179	3.99	3.95	3.96	4.05	3.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	4	7	3	4	3.39	1041/1262	3.73	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.39	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	4	6	6	3.89	987/1259	4.15	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	8	6	3	3.61	1081/1256	4.08	4.30	4.30	4.28	3.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	11	1	2	3	0	1	2.71	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.32	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 17
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C 5	General 6	Under-grad 32	Non-major 15
84-150	5	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 18		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 210 0201
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF LEARNING
 Instructor: RICHMAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 82
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1210
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	3	8	28	4.51	540/1481	4.19	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.51	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	9	31	4.71	274/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	8	29	4.59	423/1249	4.46	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	23	1	0	3	4	10	4.22	773/1424	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	8	2	6	9	15	3.53	1071/1396	3.75	4.00	3.98	3.94	3.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	35	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	****/1342	3.89	4.10	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	36	4.83	149/1459	4.48	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	16	4.39	1120/1480	4.70	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	1	16	18	4.42	459/1450	4.12	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	35	4.83	304/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	38	4.90	500/1407	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	4	33	4.68	349/1399	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	36	4.83	229/1400	4.41	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	4	4	7	20	4.14	533/1179	3.99	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	8	6	12	4.07	684/1262	3.73	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	3	3	19	4.41	680/1259	4.15	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.41	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	3	6	18	4.56	543/1256	4.08	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	18	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.98	****	
Field Work															
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	4.69	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.50	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14	Required for Majors	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 17		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	C 8	General	2
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 42
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	30
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 230 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY AND CULTURE
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1211
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	3	12	16	4.24	857/1481	4.24	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	20	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	7	20	4.41	624/1249	4.41	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	6	8	15	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	8	6	13	3.78	893/1396	3.78	4.00	3.98	3.94	3.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	11	12	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	7	21	4.53	425/1459	4.53	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	32	4.97	281/1480	4.97	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	16	10	4.17	712/1450	4.17	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	27	4.83	290/1409	4.83	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	591/1407	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	4	24	4.70	335/1399	4.70	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	24	4.63	456/1400	4.63	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	4	4	21	4.59	218/1179	4.59	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	335/1262	4.53	3.90	4.05	4.11	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	127/1259	4.94	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	224/1256	4.89	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	205/ 788	4.44	3.89	4.00	3.98	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 1 Major 16
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 3	Under-grad 32 Non-major 17
84-150	13	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0101
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 80
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1212
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	26	4.78	256/1481	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	299/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	28	4.84	178/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	364/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	8	18	4.28	476/1396	4.18	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	4	9	12	4.00	755/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	2	6	23	4.68	264/1459	4.57	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	281/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	2	9	18	4.55	296/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	24	4.74	433/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	29	4.94	350/1407	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	322/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	29	4.90	146/1400	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	6	24	4.71	157/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	21	0	2	0	1	3	5	3.82	855/1262	3.68	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	0	1	2	0	8	4.36	708/1259	3.90	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	21	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	549/1256	4.26	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	21	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 788	3.44	3.89	4.00	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 26	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 5
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 4	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 32 Non-major 27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0201
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: JORDAN, LISA
 Enrollment: 67
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1213
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	3	13	12	4.10	1012/1481	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	9	11	10	3.97	1047/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.29	3.97	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	7	11	11	3.97	927/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36	3.97	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	2	2	14	10	4.03	943/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.03	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	11	13	4.17	584/1396	4.18	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	12	13	4.13	672/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	490/1459	4.57	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	30	5.00	1/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	1	6	14	4	3.73	1115/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	4.15	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	2	6	20	4.52	750/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	3	9	15	4.24	1260/1407	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	13	11	4.17	901/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	3	11	14	4.39	716/1400	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.39	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	5	8	14	4.17	503/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	3	4	4	3	3.50	995/1262	3.68	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	1	5	3	5	3.67	1067/1259	3.90	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	1	3	6	5	4.00	901/1256	4.26	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	6	0	3	1	3	2	3.44	631/ 788	3.44	3.89	4.00	3.98	3.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	7	1.00-1.99 1	B 14		
56-83	8	2.00-2.99 2	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 32 Non-major 25
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 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	6	13	22	4.39	688/1481	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	15	21	4.37	704/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	13	23	4.41	611/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	33	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	****/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.28	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	4	2	5	12	16	3.87	823/1396	4.18	4.00	3.98	3.94	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	37	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.05	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	9	27	4.54	425/1459	4.57	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	40	4.98	211/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.98	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	17	13	4.26	620/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	32	4.73	450/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	38	4.93	400/1407	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	8	30	4.70	335/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	13	25	4.51	581/1400	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	2	5	10	19	4.28	426/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.28	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	3	1	5	6	5	3.45	1014/1262	3.68	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.45	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	2	1	4	5	8	3.80	1027/1259	3.90	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	0	3	5	10	4.05	880/1256	4.26	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.05	
4. Were special techniques successful	22	18	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 788	3.44	3.89	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	38	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	11	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors	17
28-55	12	1.00-1.99 1	B 16		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 10	C 7	General	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	16
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

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	6	0	0	1	2	7	32	4.67	395/1481	4.48	4.24	4.29	4.40	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	5	11	27	4.51	505/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.29	4.51	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	10	30	4.64	357/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.36	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	5	1	0	6	9	21	4.32	658/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.28	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	6	9	25	4.39	387/1396	4.18	4.00	3.98	3.94	4.39	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	4	9	26	4.41	394/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.05	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	1	2	1	6	32	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	1	0	0	0	5	35	4.88	743/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	0	0	0	6	10	18	4.35	525/1450	4.23	4.03	4.09	4.15	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	1	8	30	4.68	544/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.47	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	41	4.98	150/1407	4.77	4.68	4.69	4.78	4.98	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	1	3	6	31	4.55	523/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	3	34	4.68	397/1400	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.34	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	2	0	1	0	3	32	4.83	104/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	4.05	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	32	0	2	0	3	3	8	3.94	770/1262	3.68	3.90	4.05	4.11	3.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	31	0	3	1	2	2	9	3.76	1039/1259	3.90	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	32	0	1	1	0	2	12	4.44	647/1256	4.26	4.30	4.30	4.28	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	32	7	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	****/ 788	3.44	3.89	4.00	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.34	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.64	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	47	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 285 0401
 Title ABNORMAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: RESTA, PETER
 Enrollment: 63
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1215
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	11	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	1	B	12						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	48	Non-major	44
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 305 0101
 Title THE EXCEPTIONAL CHILD
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 140
 Questionnaires: 76

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1216
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	5	0	0	4	11	23	33	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	2	3	11	22	33	4.14	925/1481	4.14	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	5	0	1	4	11	18	37	4.21	773/1249	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	15	1	4	12	15	23	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	4	9	18	38	4.30	459/1396	4.30	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	28	0	1	11	9	20	4.17	615/1342	4.17	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	4	11	10	44	4.36	659/1459	4.36	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	5	64	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	0	3	2	15	21	15	3.77	1089/1450	3.77	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	5	16	48	4.57	682/1409	4.57	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	4	6	60	4.80	728/1407	4.80	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	2	2	10	15	39	4.28	810/1399	4.28	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	3	2	6	14	44	4.36	754/1400	4.36	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	1	1	8	12	42	4.45	299/1179	4.45	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	3	3	9	14	23	3.98	725/1262	3.98	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.98	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	0	1	6	6	39	4.60	516/1259	4.60	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	1	7	9	34	4.42	658/1256	4.42	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.42	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	1	2	12	10	25	4.12	358/ 788	4.12	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.12	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 26	Required for Majors	10
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 0	B 32		Graduate 0
56-83	13	2.00-2.99 19	C 7	General	22
84-150	17	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		Under-grad 76
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	29
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 306 0101
 Title LIFESPAN HUMAN DEVELOP
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 48

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1217
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	8	16	24	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	15	27	4.38	693/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	8	9	27	4.19	795/1249	4.19	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	3	2	18	22	4.31	671/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	11	32	4.54	274/1396	4.54	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	19	20	4.08	707/1342	4.08	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	12	32	4.56	390/1459	4.56	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	33	14	4.30	1185/1480	4.30	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.30	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	0	0	4	26	10	4.15	732/1450	4.15	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	42	4.89	202/1409	4.89	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	42	4.85	614/1407	4.85	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	36	4.72	300/1399	4.72	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	10	34	4.65	433/1400	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	3	9	32	4.54	238/1179	4.54	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	28	0	1	1	2	5	11	4.20	610/1262	4.20	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	461/1259	4.65	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	428/1256	4.70	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.70	
4. Were special techniques successful	28	7	0	3	0	3	7	4.08	377/ 788	4.08	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.08	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 22	Required for Majors	1
28-55	13	1.00-1.99 1	B 16		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 14	D 0		Under-grad 48
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	36
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 307 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 125
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1218
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	1	3	7	23	4.53	531/1481	4.53	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	8	24	4.54	469/1481	4.54	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	1	10	21	4.47	535/1249	4.47	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	19	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	364/1424	4.57	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	12	19	4.47	321/1396	4.47	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	28	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	****/1342	****	4.10	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	5	3	25	4.53	436/1459	4.53	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.53	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	15	18	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	4	11	13	4.32	557/1450	4.32	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	28	4.76	400/1409	4.76	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	150/1407	4.97	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	27	4.68	363/1399	4.68	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	5	26	4.65	444/1400	4.65	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	8	22	4.53	248/1179	4.53	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	4	0	3	8	8	3.70	917/1262	3.70	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	5	9	8	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	686/1256	4.39	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	13	1	2	3	3	2	3.27	686/ 788	3.27	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	34	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	35	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 307 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF AGING
 Instructor: FREIBERG, KAREN
 Enrollment: 125
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1218
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	14	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	11	Under-grad	36	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	14				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 317 0101
 Title COGNITIVE PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: GRONINGER, LOWE
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1219
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	0	9	6	6	3.61	1324/1481	3.61	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	4	6	8	3.70	1237/1481	3.70	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	3	9	6	3.52	1113/1249	3.52	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	10	8	3	3.48	1281/1424	3.48	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.48	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	7	5	6	3.50	1083/1396	3.50	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	7	8	3	3.41	1166/1342	3.41	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	3	4	8	4	3	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	2	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	421/1480	4.95	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	1	8	8	1	3.25	1307/1450	3.25	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	11	9	4.29	1013/1409	4.29	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	1194/1407	4.38	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	1	4	9	5	3.67	1196/1399	3.67	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	3	5	6	6	3.62	1200/1400	3.62	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	2	0	5	5	5	3.65	846/1179	3.65	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	2	0	0	3	3	3.63	949/1262	3.63	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1043/1259	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	1	0	3	3	3.75	1042/1256	3.75	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	5	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 10		Graduate
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	17
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 320 0101
 Title PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSESSME
 Instructor: MARTINKOWSKI, K
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1220
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	2	2	9	16	4.23	870/1481	4.23	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	6	21	4.59	422/1481	4.59	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	6	22	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	706/1424	4.29	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	5	5	20	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	11	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	454/1342	4.35	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	231/1459	4.71	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	2	27	4.93	491/1480	4.93	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	10	15	4.34	536/1450	4.34	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.34	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	24	4.77	400/1409	4.77	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	27	4.87	591/1407	4.87	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	256/1399	4.77	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	5	19	4.38	741/1400	4.38	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	1	3	8	10	3.96	641/1179	3.96	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	8	3	11	3.69	917/1262	3.69	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	5	7	15	4.37	701/1259	4.37	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	1	6	19	4.56	543/1256	4.56	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	20	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 7	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 31 Non-major 3
84-150	18	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 23	
			? 2		

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: DELAHANTY, JANI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1221
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	5	10	4.21	896/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	201/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	85/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	406/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1104/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	592/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	9	6	4.06	808/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	682/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	5	10	4.32	1232/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	723/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	13	4.47	624/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	218/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	4	5	3.91	797/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	978/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	671/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: DELAHANTY, JANI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1221
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	6	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: DELAHANTY, JANI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1222
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	5	10	4.21	896/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	201/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	85/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	406/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1104/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	592/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	836/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	4	5	3.91	797/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	978/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	671/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: DELAHANTY, JANI (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1222
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	6	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1223
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	5	10	4.21	896/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	201/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	85/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	406/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.54	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	4	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1104/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	592/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	4	4	0	3.50	1223/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.32	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.59	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	0	0	4	5	3.91	797/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	978/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	704/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	671/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 38
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1223
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	13	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	4						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	8
84-150	6	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	13				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1224
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	5	24	4.53	531/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	28	4.76	219/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	178/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	157/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	4	4	22	4.38	403/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	7	19	4.35	454/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	210/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	896/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	1	9	21	4.65	231/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	32	4.91	169/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	150/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	195/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	146/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	2	10	18	4.42	331/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	8	13	4.12	666/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	422/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	4	18	4.46	614/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	2	0	4	3	12	4.10	372/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	2	1	1	7	3.92	178/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	99/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	4.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	152/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	137/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	34	Non-major	12
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	30				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1225
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	5	24	4.53	531/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	28	4.76	219/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	178/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	157/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	4	4	22	4.38	403/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	7	19	4.35	454/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	210/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	896/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	2	2	0	4	4	2	3.33	1285/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	25	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1245/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	25	0	1	1	3	3	1	3.22	1387/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	26	0	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	****/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	****/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	26	5	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	8	13	4.12	666/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	422/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	4	18	4.46	614/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	2	0	4	3	12	4.10	372/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	2	1	1	7	3.92	178/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	99/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	4.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	152/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	137/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 20	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C 5	General 2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D 0	Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 30
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0201
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1226
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	5	24	4.53	531/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	28	4.76	219/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.76	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	28	4.85	178/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	30	4.85	157/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	4	4	22	4.38	403/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	7	19	4.35	454/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	5	28	4.74	210/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	25	4.74	896/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	14	1	0	0	3	11	5	4.11	781/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	18	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	618/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	19	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1084/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	18	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	502/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	816/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	18	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	****/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	2	8	13	4.12	666/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	422/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	3	4	18	4.46	614/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.46	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	5	2	0	4	3	12	4.10	372/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.10	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	2	1	1	7	3.92	178/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	3.92	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	99/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	4.42	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	152/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	4.36	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	2	1	0	9	4.33	137/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	4.33	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	7	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 20	Required for Majors 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	9	C 5	General 2
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	10	D 0	Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 12
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 0	Other 30
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1227
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	8	11	22	4.23	870/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	30	4.63	374/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	34	4.77	236/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	364/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	2	2	6	7	14	3.94	772/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	290/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	8	31	4.60	344/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	13	27	4.63	238/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	131/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	40	4.93	350/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	7	34	4.74	278/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	5	36	4.74	324/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	3	6	31	4.70	162/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	3	2	1	13	4.10	674/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	895/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	4	0	6	11	4.14	837/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	10	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	282/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	64/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	53/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	125/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	4.47	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	73/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	4	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B 14					
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	8	C 6	General	1	Under-grad	44	Non-major 9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	38			
				? 1					

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1228
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	8	11	22	4.23	870/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	30	4.63	374/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	34	4.77	236/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	364/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	2	2	6	7	14	3.94	772/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	290/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	8	31	4.60	344/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	1	10	15	8	3.88	989/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	826/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	21	0	0	0	4	10	9	4.22	1272/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	1	7	6	8	3.95	1049/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	2	3	5	11	4.05	1004/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	3	1	0	4	8	7	4.00	590/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	3	2	1	13	4.10	674/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	895/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	4	0	6	11	4.14	837/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	10	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	282/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	64/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	53/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	125/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	4.47	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	73/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	4	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	35
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B	14						
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	8	C	6	General	1	Under-grad	44	Non-major	9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 331 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH I
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 76
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1229
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	2	8	11	22	4.23	870/1481	4.32	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	10	30	4.63	374/1481	4.73	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	34	4.77	236/1249	4.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	364/1424	4.65	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	11	2	2	6	7	14	3.94	772/1396	3.92	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	18	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	290/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.52	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	8	31	4.60	344/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	0	41	5.00	1/1480	4.91	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	9	17	7	3.94	931/1450	4.01	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	22	0	0	0	3	6	13	4.45	826/1409	4.59	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	22	0	0	0	3	9	10	4.32	1232/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.49	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	22	0	0	0	6	7	9	4.14	938/1399	4.43	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.28	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	2	2	5	12	4.14	961/1400	4.44	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	21	3	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	641/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	3	2	1	13	4.10	674/1262	4.04	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	22	0	1	1	6	3	11	4.00	895/1259	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	4	0	6	11	4.14	837/1256	4.32	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.14	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	10	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	282/ 788	3.90	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	64/ 246	4.26	4.03	4.20	4.20	4.60	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	29	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	53/ 249	4.54	4.40	4.11	4.23	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	29	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	125/ 242	4.42	4.36	4.40	4.36	4.47	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	73/ 240	4.52	4.34	4.20	3.96	4.71	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	4	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 19	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 35
28-55	9	1.00-1.99	1	B 14			
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	8	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 44	Non-major 9
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	10	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 38		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1230
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	8	7	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	4	11	4.00	1000/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13	839/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	645/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	9	6	3.75	918/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	474/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	4	12	4.04	940/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	1133/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	6	10	5	3.86	1005/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	8	11	4.22	1055/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	766/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	3	3	7	9	4.00	1002/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	2	12	4.00	1017/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.28
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	4	6	6	3	1	2.55	1125/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	3	5	3.14	1121/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	7	3	10	3.91	978/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	6	5	9	3.86	1000/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	682/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.04	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title: EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1231
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	8	7	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	4	11	4.00	1000/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13	839/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	645/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	9	6	3.75	918/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	474/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	4	12	4.04	940/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	1133/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	2	1	6	4	1	3.07	1346/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	3	5	2	3	3.38	1315/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1350/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	1246/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1230/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	5	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	1128/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	3	5	3.14	1121/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	7	3	10	3.91	978/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	6	5	9	3.86	1000/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	682/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
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	24				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1232
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	8	7	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	4	11	4.00	1000/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13	839/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	645/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	9	6	3.75	918/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	474/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	4	12	4.04	940/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	1133/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	2	2	7	2	3.69	1146/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	3	5	2	1	3.09	1352/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1337/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	2	3	5	1	3.45	1248/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	2	4	3	1	3.09	1308/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	2	3	1	2	0	2.38	1142/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	3	5	3.14	1121/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	7	3	10	3.91	978/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	6	5	9	3.86	1000/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	682/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 23
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 24	Non-major 1
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
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 24		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0101
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1233
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	8	7	3.75	1254/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	7	4	11	4.00	1000/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	9	10	4.13	839/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	645/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	6	9	6	3.75	918/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	9	12	4.33	474/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	6	4	12	4.04	940/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.04	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	1133/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	1	1	6	2	0	2.90	1386/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	13	0	0	3	7	1	0	2.82	1383/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1376/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	13	0	0	5	4	2	0	2.73	1366/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	3	4	2	0	2.55	1360/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	3	2	3	1	2	0	2.38	1142/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	4	7	3	5	3.14	1121/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	7	3	10	3.91	978/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	0	6	5	9	3.86	1000/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	682/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.29	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Required for Majors	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		Under-grad 24
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	24
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	9	11	6	3.62	1315/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	0	9	10	6	3.57	1296/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	12	9	3.93	953/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	14	9	4.07	928/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	5	10	6	3	2.90	1329/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	2.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	17	8	4.14	660/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	11	8	8	3.76	1154/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	22	4.76	880/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	1	14	6	1	3.13	1338/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	5	10	9	3.72	1258/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	4	6	12	6	3.62	1359/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	3.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	12	9	3	3.31	1282/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	5	13	4	5	3.17	1296/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	3	5	10	7	3.73	806/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	6	3	6	3.56	976/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	4	4	3	7	3.72	1052/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.72	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	5	7	4	3.67	1069/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	13	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	****/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	28	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 26
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	7	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 29	Non-major 3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 26		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1235
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	16	16	9	3.55	1341/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	5	7	17	17	4.00	1000/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	7	16	19	4.02	885/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.02	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	6	16	20	4.04	938/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	19	4	10	5	5	2.37	1377/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	2.37	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	8	20	14	3.91	871/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.91	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	2	15	21	4.07	929/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	2	16	26	4.43	1093/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	2	3	16	16	4	3.41	1262/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	7	11	27	4.37	935/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	6	13	26	4.37	1205/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.37	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	13	11	17	3.83	1135/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	6	4	13	19	3.80	1120/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	3	4	9	8	19	3.84	739/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	22	0	5	2	7	5	6	3.20	1092/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	21	0	3	1	7	8	7	3.58	1083/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	22	0	2	2	8	5	8	3.60	1084/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	10	1	4	3	3	3	3.21	697/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.21	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	1	4	3	2	3.60	****/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	****/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	****/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	****/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	5	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	45	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	45	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	45	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	46	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 332 0301
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: MILLER, WENDY R
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 47

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1235
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	42
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	9	C	13	General	0	Under-grad	47	Non-major	5
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	40				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 332 8020
 Title EXPERIMENTAL PSYCH II
 Instructor: Alonso, Diane
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1236
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	1	9	10	4.09	1018/1481	3.75	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	493/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	298/1249	4.16	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	9	10	4.23	773/1424	4.24	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	459/1396	3.51	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	10	8	4.09	707/1342	4.21	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	565/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	351/1480	4.52	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	494/1450	3.49	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	6	16	4.57	693/1409	3.74	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	975/1407	4.06	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	523/1399	3.62	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	14	4.48	624/1400	3.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	124/1179	3.16	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	12	4.33	507/1262	3.38	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	5	1	14	4.29	764/1259	3.89	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	457/1256	3.91	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	3	1	1	6	8	3.79	522/ 788	3.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	5	6	4	1	4	2.65	245/ 246	2.65	4.03	4.20	4.20	2.65
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	2	3	3	8	4	3.45	201/ 249	3.45	4.40	4.11	4.23	3.45
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	1	3	1	3	3	9	3.74	221/ 242	3.74	4.36	4.40	4.36	3.74
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	3	1	5	5	6	3.50	199/ 240	3.50	4.34	4.20	3.96	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	1	3	3	5	3	5	3.21	188/ 217	3.21	3.89	4.04	4.11	3.21

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 1	Major 23
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 22	Non-major 0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 23		
				? 1			

Course-Section: PSYC 333 0101
 Title LAUGHTER AND HUMOR (SS)
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1237
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	9	8	10	3.59	1330/1481	3.59	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	12	14	6	3.68	1248/1481	3.68	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	12	10	3.85	1001/1249	3.85	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	11	13	6	3.67	1224/1424	3.67	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	7	20	4.36	411/1396	4.36	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	8	9	7	5	3.03	1265/1342	3.03	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.03	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	6	13	12	4.06	929/1459	4.06	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	0	32	4.94	491/1480	4.94	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	1	9	18	4	3.62	1184/1450	3.62	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	3	11	10	8	3.56	1287/1409	3.56	4.41	4.42	4.43	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	6	25	4.65	986/1407	4.65	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	6	5	13	9	3.68	1192/1399	3.68	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	7	5	15	3.79	1125/1400	3.79	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	3	7	11	13	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	4	6	7	4	4	2.92	1170/1262	2.92	3.90	4.05	4.14	2.92	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	6	4	12	3.96	928/1259	3.96	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.96	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	2	5	6	11	3.96	934/1256	3.96	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	19	1	1	2	1	1	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 15		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	14
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	4
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 335 0101
 Title: PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN
 Enrollment: 85
 Questionnaires: 58

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1238
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	5	0	0	0	4	15	34	4.57	496/1481	4.06	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	5	0	0	0	0	18	35	4.66	324/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.66	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	4	12	36	4.62	393/1249	3.94	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.62	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	5	3	0	0	6	20	24	4.36	607/1424	3.85	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	5	0	1	7	13	27	4.38	403/1396	4.10	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	7	20	24	4.29	519/1342	4.24	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	1	1	13	38	4.66	276/1459	4.51	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.66	
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	1	0	0	0	41	11	4.21	1245/1480	4.47	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	20	28	4.49	347/1450	4.06	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.49	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	0	2	1	49	4.83	290/1409	4.87	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	6	47	4.89	545/1407	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	9	43	4.79	223/1399	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	2	11	39	4.71	361/1400	4.21	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	2	12	37	4.69	167/1179	4.14	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	4	7	3	3.73	897/1262	3.52	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	44	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	****/1259	4.00	4.24	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	44	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	****/1256	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	42	11	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	****/ 788	4.00	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 27	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 39
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 13		
56-83	12	2.00-2.99 5	C 5	General 4	Under-grad 58 Non-major 19
84-150	24	3.00-3.49 19	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 42	
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 335 8020
 Title: PHYSIOLOGICAL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: REICHERT
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1239
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	0	3	2	4	3.55	1344/1481	4.06	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	2	3	3.36	1368/1481	4.01	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	1	3	3.27	1159/1249	3.94	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1316/1424	3.85	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	1	4	3.82	869/1396	4.10	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	592/1342	4.24	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	659/1459	4.51	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	904/1480	4.47	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1179/1450	4.06	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	188/1409	4.87	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1407	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	3	4	3.82	1140/1399	4.31	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	0	3	4	3.70	1170/1400	4.21	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	3	2	3	3.60	860/1179	4.14	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1070/1262	3.52	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	742/1256	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 340 0101
 Title SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1240
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	10	21	4.49	574/1481	4.49	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.49	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	7	10	18	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	14	14	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	4	6	12	11	3.91	1087/1424	3.91	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	7	24	4.53	285/1396	4.53	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	6	8	8	12	3.69	1028/1342	3.69	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	2	8	23	4.43	580/1459	4.43	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	19	16	4.46	1079/1480	4.46	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.46	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	2	13	13	4.39	483/1450	4.39	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	12	22	4.60	648/1409	4.60	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	450/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	14	17	4.37	713/1399	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	5	25	4.51	581/1400	4.51	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.51	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	5	1	10	1	3	2.80	1099/1179	2.80	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	5	4	20	4.52	340/1262	4.52	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	24	4.76	358/1259	4.76	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.76	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	224/1256	4.90	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	5	8	15	4.36	244/ 788	4.36	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 17		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 8	C 3	General	4
84-150	10	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		Under-grad 36
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	23
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 342 0101
 Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION
 Instructor: SCHULTZ, DAVID
 Enrollment: 61
 Questionnaires: 34

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1241
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	17	14	4.29	792/1481	4.53	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	10	17	4.26	811/1481	4.40	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	14	14	4.09	861/1249	4.12	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.09	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	8	13	8	3.73	1202/1424	4.09	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	11	20	4.55	274/1396	4.62	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	9	12	8	3.70	1023/1342	4.04	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	11	18	4.39	623/1459	3.66	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	491/1480	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	5	11	11	4.07	803/1450	4.38	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	3	9	18	4.31	990/1409	4.39	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	10	22	4.69	941/1407	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	6	12	12	4.06	980/1399	4.34	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	14	13	4.19	913/1400	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	6	7	17	4.29	411/1179	4.01	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	570/1262	4.28	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	588/1259	4.63	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	571/1256	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	4	3	1	4	7	1	3.13	707/ 788	3.13	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.13	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	13
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 34
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 2		

Course-Section: PSYC 342 8020
 Title PSYCH OF AGGRESSION
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1242
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	15	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	280/1481	4.53	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	15	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	481/1481	4.40	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	15	0	0	0	5	1	7	4.15	817/1249	4.12	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.15	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	15	2	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	497/1424	4.09	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	169/1396	4.62	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	424/1342	4.04	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	15	1	3	1	3	4	1	2.92	1403/1459	3.66	4.21	4.16	4.17	2.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	15	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	871/1480	4.85	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	196/1450	4.38	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	813/1409	4.39	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	400/1407	4.81	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	445/1399	4.34	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	312/1400	4.47	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	16	1	1	0	3	4	3	3.73	813/1179	4.01	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	537/1262	4.28	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	358/1259	4.63	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	264/1256	4.67	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	7	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	****/ 788	3.13	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	27	Non-major	23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 355 0101
 Title: COMPARATIVE PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: WISNIEWSKI, TIM
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1243
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	2	3	16	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	458/1481	4.55	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.55	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	298/1249	4.70	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	5	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	928/1424	4.07	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	6	7	8	4.10	649/1396	4.10	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.10	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	13	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	436/1459	4.52	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	18	2	4.05	1339/1480	4.05	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	603/1409	4.63	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	0	16	4.68	941/1407	4.68	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.68	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	491/1399	4.58	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.58	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	336/1400	4.74	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	2	1	3	3	8	3.82	746/1179	3.82	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	236/1262	4.71	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	257/1259	4.86	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	98/ 788	4.78	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.78	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 24
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	13
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 356 0101
 Title PSYC OF SEX DIFFERENCE
 Instructor: O'BRIEN, EILEEN
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1244
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	4	7	3.83	1206/1481	3.83	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	8	4	3.78	1194/1481	3.78	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	945/1249	3.94	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	2	9	4.06	933/1424	4.06	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	1	4	5	3	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	444/1342	4.36	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	2	10	4.11	899/1459	4.11	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	11	1	3.72	1442/1480	3.72	4.69	4.68	4.65	3.72	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	5	4	3	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	1031/1409	4.25	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	5	8	4.25	1257/1407	4.25	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	2	4	8	4.13	947/1399	4.13	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	1	9	3.88	1098/1400	3.88	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	2	3	0	10	4.20	487/1179	4.20	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	146/1262	4.86	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1259	4.86	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	515/ 788	3.80	3.89	4.00	4.07	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10	Graduate	0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	10
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 7	D 0	Under-grad	18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	4	9	16	11	11	3.31	1413/1481	3.20	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.31	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	9	8	18	5	10	2.98	1424/1481	3.10	4.23	4.23	4.23	2.98	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	10	12	11	7	11	2.94	1202/1249	2.97	4.32	4.27	4.28	2.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	41	1	2	4	1	1	2.89	****/1424	2.93	4.22	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	11	14	9	10	4	2.63	1356/1396	2.73	4.00	3.98	4.00	2.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	45	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	****/1342	3.00	4.10	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	7	5	13	24	3.98	978/1459	3.90	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.98	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	18	18	4	8	3.00	1469/1480	3.82	4.69	4.68	4.65	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	2	7	3	13	16	2	3.07	1346/1450	2.97	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	11	36	4.64	588/1409	4.41	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	4	11	34	4.54	1076/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.54	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	8	9	17	11	3.42	1255/1399	3.14	4.28	4.26	4.27	3.42	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	6	7	14	18	3.63	1197/1400	3.31	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	3	5	9	9	17	3.74	800/1179	3.37	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	25	0	14	3	6	2	2	2.07	1243/1262	2.30	3.90	4.05	4.14	2.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	27	0	10	2	7	2	4	2.52	1225/1259	2.33	4.24	4.29	4.34	2.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	8	3	6	2	5	2.71	1210/1256	2.62	4.30	4.30	4.34	2.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	27	24	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	50	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	50	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	50	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	50	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	51	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	51	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	9	C	16	General	5	Under-grad	52	Non-major	24
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	18	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	38				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 360 8020
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1246
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	2	7	4	5	3.09	1443/1481	3.20	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	6	5	5	3.22	1392/1481	3.10	4.23	4.23	4.23	3.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	10	1	4	5	3.00	1193/1249	2.97	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	4	3	1	2	4	2.93	1380/1424	2.93	4.22	4.21	4.27	2.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	3	6	5	3	2.83	1338/1396	2.73	4.00	3.98	4.00	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	16	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	4	5	1	12	3.83	1109/1459	3.90	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	8	14	4.64	974/1480	3.82	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	3	1	6	3	1	2.86	1392/1450	2.97	4.03	4.09	4.10	2.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	2	4	14	4.17	1080/1409	4.41	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	4	3	13	4.18	1279/1407	4.36	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.18	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	7	2	3	5	4	2.86	1352/1399	3.14	4.28	4.26	4.27	2.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	6	2	3	6	4	3.00	1312/1400	3.31	4.26	4.27	4.28	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	7	2	4	2	7	3.00	1041/1179	3.37	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	9	2	2	6	2	2.52	1221/1262	2.30	3.90	4.05	4.14	2.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	9	5	3	3	1	2.14	1246/1259	2.33	4.24	4.29	4.34	2.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	5	6	5	4	1	2.52	1219/1256	2.62	4.30	4.30	4.34	2.52	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	16	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 360 8020
 Title PSYCHOLOGY OF MOTIVATI
 Instructor: RABIN, BERNARD
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1246
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	1	Major	14
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	9	Under-grad	23	Non-major	10
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D	1						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	4						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: PSYC 363 0101
 Title EATING: NORMAL/ABNORMA
 Instructor: WARWICK, ZOE
 Enrollment: 46
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1247
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	7	14	4.14	976/1481	4.14	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	4	19	4.38	693/1481	4.38	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	19	4.52	488/1249	4.52	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	8	15	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	8	3	11	3.45	1114/1396	3.45	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	8	14	4.17	615/1342	4.17	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	21	4.62	321/1459	4.62	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	25	3	4.11	1324/1480	4.11	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	9	11	5	3.63	1179/1450	3.63	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	8	16	4.32	979/1409	4.32	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	1031/1407	4.61	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	7	6	14	4.14	929/1399	4.14	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	7	16	4.21	898/1400	4.21	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	3	3	4	15	4.12	549/1179	4.12	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	1059/1262	3.33	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	1	2	2	0	7	3.83	1012/1259	3.83	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	1	1	2	1	7	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	8	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 18	Required for Majors	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	6
84-150	12	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	14
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0101
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: PARKER, LESLIE
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1248
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	12	10	14	3.97	1096/1481	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.29	3.97	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	11	20	4.32	747/1481	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	13	19	4.32	687/1249	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	29	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	****/1424	3.93	4.22	4.21	4.27	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	6	10	15	3.89	816/1396	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	32	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1342	3.76	4.10	4.07	4.12	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	26	4.65	298/1459	4.25	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	4	32	4.89	729/1480	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	1	0	6	13	7	3.93	945/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	4.10	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	7	26	4.54	716/1409	4.66	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	7	28	4.70	919/1407	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	15	19	4.35	733/1399	4.52	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	8	23	4.44	658/1400	4.63	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	13	3	2	7	5	6	3.39	948/1179	3.64	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.39	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	2	2	4	1	5	3.36	1052/1262	3.81	3.90	4.05	4.14	3.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1094/1259	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.34	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	4	0	2	4	4	3.29	1141/1256	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.34	3.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	11	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	36	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0101
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: PARKER, LESLIE
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1248
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	7	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	26
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	21						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	37	Non-major	11
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1249
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	27	4.64	417/1481	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	13	20	4.34	725/1481	4.33	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.34	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	12	23	4.46	548/1249	4.39	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	1	8	9	11	3.93	1048/1424	3.93	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	12	19	4.30	467/1396	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	1	8	15	10	3.76	987/1342	3.76	4.10	4.07	4.12	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	4	9	6	17	3.84	1094/1459	4.25	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	6	32	4.77	871/1480	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	15	24	4.62	252/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	30	4.78	367/1409	4.66	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	37	4.95	300/1407	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	8	29	4.68	349/1399	4.52	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	32	4.82	239/1400	4.63	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	8	0	2	8	8	9	3.89	705/1179	3.64	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	563/1262	3.81	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	294/1259	4.16	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	382/1256	4.01	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	9	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.34	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 380 0102
 Title PERSONALITY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1249
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	24
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	17						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	39	Non-major	15
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	20				
				?	4						

Course-Section: PSYC 380H 0102
 Title PERSONALITY HONORS
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1250
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	439/1481	4.63	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	245/1249	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	0	1	3	3.83	1138/1424	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.27	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	647/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	245/1450	4.63	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.63	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	618/1409	4.63	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	741/1400	4.38	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	870/1179	3.57	3.95	3.96	4.02	3.57	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	645/1262	4.14	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1259	4.57	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	754/1256	4.29	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	749/ 788	2.67	3.89	4.00	4.07	2.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 382 0101
 Title CHILD/ADOL PSYCHOPATHL
 Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT
 Enrollment: 57
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1251
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	10	23	4.60	461/1481	4.60	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	183/1481	4.80	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	30	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	9	21	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	3	8	20	4.23	527/1396	4.23	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	8	20	4.34	464/1342	4.34	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.34	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	29	4.83	149/1459	4.83	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	24	10	4.29	1185/1480	4.29	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	13	14	4.41	459/1450	4.41	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.41	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	450/1407	4.91	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	28	4.77	245/1399	4.77	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	27	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	5	12	16	4.26	434/1179	4.26	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	5	2	10	4.05	691/1262	4.05	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.05	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	1	2	1	15	4.58	532/1259	4.58	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	438/1256	4.68	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.68	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	13	1	1	0	1	3	3.67	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 23	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0 Major 22
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 5	C 2	General 7	Under-grad 35 Non-major 13
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 20	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 385 0101
 Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: MCGUIRE, LYNNAN
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 56

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1252
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	11	0	0	0	2	8	35	4.73	316/1481	4.72	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	12	0	0	0	0	11	33	4.75	228/1481	4.66	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	0	8	37	4.82	190/1249	4.63	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	11	0	0	0	4	11	30	4.58	364/1424	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	12	0	5	5	8	9	17	3.64	1005/1396	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	6	14	24	4.36	454/1342	4.25	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	11	0	0	0	1	6	38	4.82	149/1459	3.91	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	11	0	0	0	0	27	18	4.40	1114/1480	4.70	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	0	0	0	15	29	4.66	224/1450	4.76	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	0	3	42	4.93	131/1409	4.80	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	1	3	42	4.89	522/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	1	4	40	4.87	162/1399	4.85	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	41	4.93	102/1400	4.88	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	1	0	3	4	37	4.69	167/1179	4.47	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	48	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	****/1262	4.83	3.90	4.05	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	48	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	****/1259	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.34	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	48	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	****/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.34	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	48	0	0	0	3	1	4	4.13	****/ 788	4.33	3.89	4.00	4.07	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	55	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	4.23	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 30	Required for Majors	6
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 12		Graduate
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	D 0		0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	26
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 385 8020
 Title HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: ANDERSON, ROBER
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1253
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	4.71	340/1481	4.72	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	434/1481	4.66	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	598/1249	4.63	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	807/1424	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	476/1396	3.96	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	649/1342	4.25	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1380/1459	3.91	4.21	4.16	4.17	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	4.70	4.69	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	119/1450	4.76	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	559/1409	4.80	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	659/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.67	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	187/1399	4.85	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1400	4.88	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	442/1179	4.47	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	154/1262	4.83	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	2 Under-grad 7 Non-major 5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 387 0101
 Title COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: MATON, KENNETH
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1254
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	8	8	4.50	549/1481	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	758/1481	4.31	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	823/1396	3.88	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	8	7	4.31	494/1342	4.31	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	743/1480	4.88	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	852/1409	4.44	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	613/1399	4.47	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	9	4.56	531/1400	4.56	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	6	0	5	2	1	2.43	1137/1179	2.43	3.95	3.96	4.02	2.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	437/1262	4.40	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	380/1259	4.73	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	382/1256	4.73	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	3.89	4.00	4.07	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	12
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 393B 0101
 Title PARENTING
 Instructor: HUSSEY-GARDNER,
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1255
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	17	4.74	316/1481	4.74	4.24	4.29	4.29	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	246/1481	4.74	4.23	4.23	4.23	4.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	442/1249	4.57	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	334/1424	4.61	4.22	4.21	4.27	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	3	6	8	3.59	1030/1396	3.59	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	4.30	504/1342	4.30	4.10	4.07	4.12	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	20	4.70	242/1459	4.70	4.21	4.16	4.17	4.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	1001/1480	4.59	4.69	4.68	4.65	4.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	5	12	4.35	525/1450	4.35	4.03	4.09	4.10	4.35	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	94/1409	4.95	4.41	4.42	4.43	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.27	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	73/1400	4.95	4.26	4.27	4.28	4.95	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	129/1179	4.76	3.95	3.96	4.02	4.76	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	305/1262	4.58	3.90	4.05	4.14	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	524/1259	4.58	4.24	4.29	4.34	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.30	4.30	4.34	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	3.89	4.00	4.07	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	9
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 23
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
			? 1		

Course-Section: PSYC 407 0101
 Title ADV CHILD PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1256
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	1179/1481	3.80	4.23	4.23	4.32	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	2	7	3.80	1022/1249	3.80	4.32	4.27	4.44	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	4	3.87	1116/1424	3.87	4.22	4.21	4.35	3.87	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	4	3.80	877/1396	3.80	4.00	3.98	4.09	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	6	3	3.73	999/1342	3.73	4.10	4.07	4.21	3.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	929/1459	4.07	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	5	1	3.45	1245/1450	3.45	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	3	3	8	4.13	1104/1409	4.13	4.41	4.42	4.51	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1084/1407	4.53	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	6	4	3.93	1067/1399	3.93	4.28	4.26	4.36	3.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	913/1400	4.20	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	7	4	2	3.27	994/1179	3.27	3.95	3.96	4.07	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	872/1259	4.08	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	3	4	3	3.50	1106/1256	3.50	4.30	4.30	4.60	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	710/ 788	3.10	3.89	4.00	4.26	3.10	

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 8		Graduate
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	9	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	11
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 409 0101
 Title INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPME
 Instructor: BAKER, LINDA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1257
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	6	8	4.24	870/1481	4.24	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	979/1481	4.06	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	3	5	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	671/1424	4.31	4.22	4.21	4.35	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	252/1396	4.59	4.00	3.98	4.09	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	615/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.21	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	6	6	3.82	1109/1459	3.82	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	588/1409	4.65	4.41	4.42	4.51	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	733/1399	4.35	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	0	6	8	4.12	977/1400	4.12	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.12	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	384/1179	4.33	3.95	3.96	4.07	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	315/1262	4.56	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	238/1259	4.88	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.30	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	111/ 788	4.73	3.89	4.00	4.26	4.73	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	41/ 68	4.69	4.84	4.49	4.68	4.69	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	3	3	11	4.47	39/ 69	4.47	4.74	4.53	4.64	4.47	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	28/ 63	4.65	4.66	4.44	4.49	4.65	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	39/ 69	4.44	4.52	4.35	4.53	4.44	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	1	1	4	6	4	3.69	44/ 68	3.69	4.04	3.92	4.10	3.69	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 424 0101
 Title INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1258
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	7	0	2	7	4	11	11	3.63	1315/1481	3.63	4.24	4.29	4.45	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	1	5	7	10	12	3.77	1194/1481	3.77	4.23	4.23	4.32	3.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	6	1	1	6	11	9	3.93	962/1249	3.93	4.32	4.27	4.44	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	4	5	13	12	3.97	997/1424	3.97	4.22	4.21	4.35	3.97	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	1	1	6	7	5	16	3.83	861/1396	3.83	4.00	3.98	4.09	3.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	3	7	10	14	3.86	912/1342	3.86	4.10	4.07	4.21	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	6	4	8	8	9	3.29	1331/1459	3.29	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	1	0	0	0	15	20	4.57	1011/1480	4.57	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	1	2	2	14	5	7	3.43	1253/1450	3.43	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	1	6	10	10	8	3.51	1291/1409	3.51	4.41	4.42	4.51	3.51	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	1	2	5	27	4.66	975/1407	4.66	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.66	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	3	5	7	10	10	3.54	1229/1399	3.54	4.28	4.26	4.36	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	8	3	8	14	3.69	1176/1400	3.69	4.26	4.27	4.38	3.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	8	6	2	1	6	10	9	3.82	746/1179	3.82	3.95	3.96	4.07	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	24	0	2	1	3	4	8	3.83	842/1262	3.83	3.90	4.05	4.33	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	24	0	1	0	1	2	14	4.56	548/1259	4.56	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	24	0	1	0	1	4	12	4.44	636/1256	4.44	4.30	4.30	4.60	4.44	
4. Were special techniques successful	24	2	0	0	5	4	7	4.13	358/ 788	4.13	3.89	4.00	4.26	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.45	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	3.87	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.34	4.20	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	3.86	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.56	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	4.00	4.60	4.91	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.50	4.26	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	41	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.00	4.42	4.83	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 51	****	3.89	4.65	4.71	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	3.82	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	40	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.08	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: PSYC 424 0101
 Title INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE
 Instructor: FOX, MARY H
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1258
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	26	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	28
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	42	Non-major	14
84-150	19	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	7	0	0	1	3	11	17	4.38	708/1481	4.44	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	3	3	8	18	4.28	790/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.28	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	8	0	0	0	3	6	22	4.61	393/1249	4.36	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	8	3	1	1	3	5	18	4.36	620/1424	4.48	4.22	4.21	4.35	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	11	18	4.44	355/1396	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	4	8	19	4.41	405/1342	4.30	4.10	4.07	4.21	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	5	3	6	18	4.16	863/1459	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	3	15	14	4.34	1152/1480	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.34	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	2	0	0	2	12	11	4.36	515/1450	4.47	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	1	2	14	15	4.34	957/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.51	4.34	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	31	4.97	200/1407	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	3	8	19	4.38	713/1399	4.44	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	9	22	4.66	433/1400	4.48	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.66	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	3	1	1	4	6	15	4.22	464/1179	4.17	3.95	3.96	4.07	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	2	7	10	4.42	418/1262	4.35	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	615/1259	4.59	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	382/1256	4.80	4.30	4.30	4.60	4.74	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	2	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	213/ 788	4.37	3.89	4.00	4.26	4.41	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	3.87	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.68	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.64	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.49	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.53	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	4.10	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	5.00	4.30	4.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	3.00	4.00	4.56	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.11	4.55	4.86	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	38	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.14	4.75	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 21	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4	
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	7	C 3	General 5
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	7	D 0	Under-grad 39
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 16
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 0
				? 1	Other 21
					#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 446 8020
 Title INDUSTRIAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: Alonso, Diane
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1260
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	6	4.50	549/1481	4.44	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	399/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	854/1249	4.36	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	334/1424	4.48	4.22	4.21	4.35	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	707/1396	4.22	4.00	3.98	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	592/1342	4.30	4.10	4.07	4.21	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	460/1459	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	281/1450	4.47	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1409	4.67	4.41	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1407	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	567/1399	4.44	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	829/1400	4.48	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.30	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	0	0	7	4.11	549/1179	4.17	3.95	3.96	4.07	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	550/1262	4.35	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.59	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.80	4.30	4.30	4.60	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	254/ 788	4.37	3.89	4.00	4.26	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 475 0101
 Title CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGY
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1261
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	10	19	4.29	805/1481	4.29	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	14	19	4.49	545/1481	4.49	4.23	4.23	4.32	4.49	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	12	17	4.23	765/1249	4.23	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	29	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	****/1424	****	4.22	4.21	4.35	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	8	19	4.23	527/1396	4.23	4.00	3.98	4.09	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	31	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/1342	****	4.10	4.07	4.21	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	11	24	4.69	253/1459	4.69	4.21	4.16	4.25	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	33	4.94	421/1480	4.94	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	4	15	15	4.26	630/1450	4.26	4.03	4.09	4.28	4.26	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	6	28	4.82	304/1409	4.82	4.41	4.42	4.51	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	4	29	4.82	682/1407	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	10	23	4.65	404/1399	4.65	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	26	4.68	409/1400	4.68	4.26	4.27	4.38	4.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	2	6	6	9	3.72	813/1179	3.72	3.95	3.96	4.07	3.72	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	5	9	15	4.06	687/1262	4.06	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	9	21	4.55	556/1259	4.55	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	4	11	16	4.21	797/1256	4.21	4.30	4.30	4.60	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	27	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 29
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 18		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 6	C 5	General 16	Under-grad 35 Non-major 6
84-150	23	3.00-3.49 13	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 19	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 493A 0101
 Title TOPICS IN SOC/HLTH PSY
 Instructor: BEDIAKO, SHAWN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1262
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	928/1481	4.19	4.24	4.29	4.45	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	8	5	2	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.23	4.23	4.32	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.32	4.27	4.44	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1048/1424	3.94	4.22	4.21	4.35	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	263/1396	4.56	4.00	3.98	4.09	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	845/1342	3.94	4.10	4.07	4.21	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	4	4	1	5	3.19	1352/1459	3.19	4.21	4.16	4.25	3.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1133/1480	4.38	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	5	7	3	3.87	1005/1450	3.87	4.03	4.09	4.28	3.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	8	5	3	3.69	1267/1409	3.69	4.41	4.42	4.51	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.68	4.69	4.79	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.28	4.26	4.36	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1067/1400	3.94	4.26	4.27	4.38	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	1174/1179	1.75	3.95	3.96	4.07	1.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	220/1262	4.73	3.90	4.05	4.33	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.57	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	151/1256	4.93	4.30	4.30	4.60	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	1	1	1	1	4	3.75	533/ 788	3.75	3.89	4.00	4.26	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	11
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: PSYC 601A 0101
 Title SEM:VERBAL BEHAVIOR
 Instructor: CATANIA, A. CHA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1263
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	4	2	3.67	1253/1481	3.67	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	861/1249	4.08	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	136/1396	4.75	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	603/1342	4.18	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	6	2	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	631/1480	4.92	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	1	3	6	0	3.50	1223/1450	3.50	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	6	4	1	0	2.55	1394/1409	2.55	4.41	4.42	4.36	2.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	5	2	4	1	3.08	1317/1399	3.08	4.28	4.26	4.16	3.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	5	2	1	1	2.33	1383/1400	2.33	4.26	4.27	4.17	2.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	4	4	3	0	2.91	1087/1179	2.91	3.95	3.96	3.81	2.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	797/1262	3.90	3.90	4.05	4.07	3.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	650/ 788	3.40	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.40	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.23	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601C 0101
 Title: QUALITATIVE METHODS
 Instructor: BRODSKY, ANNE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1264
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1253/1481	3.67	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1193/1249	3.00	4.32	4.27	4.24	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1316/1424	3.33	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	951/1480	4.67	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.95	3.96	3.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	729/1259	4.33	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	564/ 788	3.67	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.67	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 59	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.01	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	46/ 51	3.00	3.00	4.00	3.81	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	27/ 36	4.00	4.00	4.60	4.65	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	30/ 41	3.50	3.50	4.26	4.27	3.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	23/ 31	4.00	4.00	4.42	4.58	4.00	

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 0		Graduate 2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 3
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 601D 0101
 Title INTERVIEWING TECHNIQUE
 Instructor: CARLTON, CHRIST
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1265
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1206/1481	3.83	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	2.25	1383/1396	2.25	4.00	3.98	4.00	2.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	3.00	1269/1342	3.00	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1160/1450	3.67	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	883/1399	4.20	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	913/1400	4.20	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	760/1179	3.80	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	631/1262	4.17	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.30	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	218/ 788	4.40	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.40	

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 5	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 1	Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 6		
				? 0			

Course-Section: PSYC 601E 0101
 Title STRUCTRL EQUATION MODE
 Instructor: STAPLETON, LAUR
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1266
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	1/1481	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	434/1481	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1249	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	3	3.86	839/1396	3.86	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.10	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	131/1459	4.86	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	281/1450	4.57	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.95	3.96	3.81	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	887/1262	3.75	3.90	4.05	4.07	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.00	

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

Course-Section: PSYC 601F 0101
 Title CORE II
 Instructor: DICLEMENTE, CAR
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1267
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	10	5	3.86	1187/1481	3.86	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	9	7	5	3.73	1221/1481	3.73	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	1022/1249	3.80	4.32	4.27	4.24	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	7	6	2	3.67	1224/1424	3.67	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	9	8	4.09	649/1396	4.09	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	7	9	3	3.70	1018/1342	3.70	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	5	5	1	7	3.30	1327/1459	3.30	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	0	19	4.81	839/1480	4.81	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	14	7	4.27	609/1450	4.27	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	11	4.48	800/1409	4.48	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.48	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	899/1407	4.71	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	445/1399	4.62	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	11	9	4.38	729/1400	4.38	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	7	8	3.95	641/1179	3.95	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	4	12	4.42	418/1262	4.42	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	3	15	4.68	432/1259	4.68	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	516/1256	4.60	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	13	0	3	2	1	1	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 13
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	13	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 2		

Course-Section: PSYC 601G 0101
 Title CORE II
 Instructor: SCHAEFFER, CYNT
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1268
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	8	5	3.94	1124/1481	3.94	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	6	6	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1036/1249	3.78	4.32	4.27	4.24	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	840/1424	4.17	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	633/1396	4.11	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	6	7	2	3.63	1060/1342	3.63	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	2	3	6	3.28	1333/1459	3.28	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	7	7	4.31	567/1450	4.31	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	878/1409	4.41	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	919/1407	4.71	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	545/1399	4.53	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	766/1400	4.35	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	0	2	11	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.95	3.96	3.81	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	345/1262	4.50	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	294/1259	4.81	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	438/1256	4.69	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	12	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 9 Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 9 Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 14	
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 601H 0101
 Title: PHYSIO SYSTEMS
 Instructor: GLASGOW, MICHAEL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1269
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	196/1481	4.86	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	790/1481	4.29	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	807/1424	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1166/1342	3.40	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	131/1459	4.86	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	445/1450	4.43	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	682/1409	4.57	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	491/1399	4.57	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.95	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	842/1262	3.83	3.90	4.05	4.07	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.30	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.97	****	

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

Course-Section: PSYC 604 0101
 Title BIOL BASES OF BHVR DEV
 Instructor: PROVINE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1270
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	9	2	3.86	1193/1481	3.86	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.86	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	6	1	3.43	1355/1481	3.43	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	2	8	4.07	865/1249	4.07	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	4	3	3.50	1275/1424	3.50	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	2	3	3.00	1292/1396	3.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	2	2	2.92	1296/1342	2.92	4.10	4.07	4.18	2.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	1	7	3.93	1030/1459	3.93	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	7	6	0	3.36	1280/1450	3.36	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	4	6	0	3.00	1356/1409	3.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.93	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	3	5	1	2.93	1343/1399	2.93	4.28	4.26	4.16	2.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	6	4.14	953/1400	4.14	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.14	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	2	4	2	2	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	6	4	0	2.86	1183/1262	2.86	3.90	4.05	4.07	2.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	4	5	3	3.64	1071/1259	3.64	4.24	4.29	4.30	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	1	5	4	2	3.38	1127/1256	3.38	4.30	4.30	4.33	3.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	12	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.97	****	

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 5		Graduate 13
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 1
Grad.	13	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: PSYC 616 0101
 Title MEAS APPL BEHAV AN
 Instructor: RICHMAN, DAVID
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1271
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	5	4.22	883/1481	4.22	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	603/1481	4.44	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	679/1249	4.33	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	385/1424	4.56	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	126/1396	4.78	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	434/1342	4.38	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	863/1480	4.78	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	568/1407	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	153/1399	4.88	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	741/1400	4.38	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	972/1179	3.33	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	138/1262	4.88	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	650/ 788	3.40	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.40	

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	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: PSYC 621 0101
 Title METHODS OF ASSESSMENT
 Instructor: MORAN, MARIANNE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1272
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	3	4.20	918/1481	4.20	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	399/1481	4.60	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	405/1249	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	241/1396	4.60	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	112/1342	4.80	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	344/1459	4.60	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.95	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	345/1262	4.50	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	773/1256	4.25	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.33	

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 3		Graduate 3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		

Course-Section: PSYC 622 0101
 Title CLINICAL INTERVENTN I
 Instructor: DELUTY, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1273
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	3	4.11	996/1481	4.11	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1130/1481	3.89	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	573/1249	4.44	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1424	****	4.22	4.21	4.16	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	4	4.11	633/1396	4.11	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1342	****	4.10	4.07	4.18	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	1081/1450	3.78	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1409	4.89	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	545/1407	4.89	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	245/1399	4.78	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	5	4.22	890/1400	4.22	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.95	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1113/1259	3.44	4.24	4.29	4.30	3.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1069/1256	3.67	4.30	4.30	4.33	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	278/ 788	4.29	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 646 0101
 Title CLINICAL NEUROPSYCHOLO
 Instructor: WALDSTEIN, SHAR
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1274
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	4.57	487/1481	4.57	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	434/1481	4.57	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	157/1424	4.86	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	4	3.86	839/1396	3.86	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	153/1342	4.71	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	580/1459	4.43	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	445/1450	4.43	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	865/1409	4.43	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	614/1407	4.86	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	311/1399	4.71	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	361/1400	4.71	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	894/1179	3.50	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	4.43	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.86	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	3.89	4.00	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 650 0101
 Title CHILD CLINICL PSYCHOLO
 Instructor: DAHLQUIST, LYNN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1275
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	210/1481	4.83	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	324/1481	4.67	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	165/1424	4.83	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	435/1396	4.33	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	276/1459	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.28	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	437/1262	4.40	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	304/1259	4.80	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	516/1256	4.60	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.84	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.74	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	28/ 63	4.67	4.66	4.44	4.44	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	34/ 69	4.60	4.52	4.35	4.16	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	30/ 68	4.40	4.04	3.92	3.71	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	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	2	Non-major	6
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: PSYC 656 0101
 Title APPLIED SOCIAL PSYC
 Instructor: BLASS, THOMAS
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1276
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	2	4	1	3.20	1426/1481	3.20	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	2	1	3.10	1412/1481	3.10	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1081/1249	3.67	4.32	4.27	4.24	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	5	1	3.70	959/1396	3.70	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1115/1342	3.50	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	6	0	1	3	3.10	1369/1459	3.10	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	4	1	1	3.13	1338/1450	3.13	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	930/1407	4.70	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	4	1	3.40	1260/1399	3.40	4.28	4.26	4.16	3.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	0	4	2	3.40	1256/1400	3.40	4.26	4.27	4.17	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	827/1179	3.70	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	1223/1262	2.50	3.90	4.05	4.07	2.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	2	1	3	3.50	1094/1259	3.50	4.24	4.29	4.30	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1162/1256	3.13	4.30	4.30	4.33	3.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 686 0101
 Title ETHICAL & PRO ISSUES
 Instructor: BARNETT, JEFF
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1277
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	10	4.77	280/1481	4.77	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	286/1481	4.69	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	451/1249	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	485/1424	4.46	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1104/1396	3.46	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.46	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	283/1342	4.54	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	635/1459	4.38	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	928/1480	4.69	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	633/1409	4.62	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	450/1407	4.92	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	178/1399	4.85	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	480/1400	4.62	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.62	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	671/1179	3.92	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	708/1262	4.00	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	509/1259	4.60	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	680/1256	4.40	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	6	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.50	

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 3		Graduate 9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	9	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: PSYC 695A 0101
 Title: DIVERSITY
 Instructor: JORDAN, LISA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1278
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	3	4.08	1018/1481	4.08	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	1160/1481	3.83	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1248/1424	3.58	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	10	1	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	987/1342	3.75	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	2	3.58	1233/1459	3.58	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	8	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.75	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	2	3.75	1145/1400	3.75	4.26	4.27	4.17	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	4	5	1	3.25	997/1179	3.25	3.95	3.96	3.81	3.25	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	4	3	3.83	842/1262	3.83	3.90	4.05	4.07	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	524/1259	4.58	4.24	4.29	4.30	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	527/1256	4.58	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	5	5	1	3.64	574/ 788	3.64	3.89	4.00	3.97	3.64	

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 2		Graduate 8
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 12
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	12
			? 2		

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1279
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	4	4	3	3.54	1347/1481	3.54	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	2	1	4	3.08	1414/1481	3.08	4.23	4.23	4.11	3.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	2	4	3.38	1303/1424	3.38	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	3	3.62	1018/1396	3.62	4.00	3.98	4.00	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	1	6	3.85	927/1342	3.85	4.10	4.07	4.18	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	2	2	2	2.69	1417/1459	2.69	4.21	4.16	4.01	2.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	3	1	4	2	3.27	1301/1450	3.27	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	2	4	3	3.31	1332/1409	3.31	4.41	4.42	4.36	3.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	2	2	5	3.46	1375/1407	3.46	4.68	4.69	4.73	3.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	4	2	3	3	3.23	1297/1399	3.23	4.28	4.26	4.16	3.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	3	4	3.23	1286/1400	3.23	4.26	4.27	4.17	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	10	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/1179	****	3.95	3.96	3.81	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	3	0	2	1	2.63	1210/1262	2.63	3.90	4.05	4.07	2.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	4	0	1	2	2.88	1190/1259	2.88	4.24	4.29	4.30	2.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	3	2	1	1	2.75	1206/1256	2.75	4.30	4.30	4.33	2.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.89	4.00	3.97	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 711 0101
 Title DATA ANALYTIC PROCED I
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1280
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	14	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	113/1249	4.93	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	302/1424	4.64	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	13	4.71	156/1396	4.71	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	303/1342	4.50	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	561/1480	4.93	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	231/1450	4.64	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	256/1399	4.77	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.26	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1179	****	3.95	3.96	3.81	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1262	****	3.90	4.05	4.07	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1259	****	4.24	4.29	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.30	4.30	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 9
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 5
Grad.	9	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: PSYC 711L 0101
 Title DATA ANALY. PROCED. II
 Instructor: PITTS, STEVEN C
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1281
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	4	5	3	3.92	1152/1481	3.92	4.24	4.29	4.28	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	5	4.08	971/1481	4.08	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1138/1424	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.16	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	257/1396	4.57	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1236/1459	3.57	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1029/1480	4.54	4.69	4.68	4.74	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	3.38	1272/1450	3.38	4.03	4.09	3.96	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	1152/1409	4.00	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1296/1407	4.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	1219/1400	3.55	4.26	4.27	4.17	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	526/1179	4.14	3.95	3.96	3.81	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1262	****	3.90	4.05	4.07	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1259	****	4.24	4.29	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1256	****	4.30	4.30	4.33	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.03	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.40	4.11	3.93	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.36	4.40	4.27	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.34	4.20	4.15	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	3.89	4.04	3.73	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 721 0101
 Title ASSESSMENT
 Instructor: SONNENSCHNEIN, S
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1282
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	4	2	4.33	749/1481	4.33	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1249	****	4.32	4.27	4.24	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	584/1396	4.17	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	1318/1459	3.33	4.21	4.16	4.01	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.69	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	659/1407	4.83	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	1130/1399	3.83	4.28	4.26	4.16	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	937/1400	4.17	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1262	****	3.90	4.05	4.07	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1259	****	4.24	4.29	4.30	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: PSYC 730 0101
 Title PARENTING
 Instructor: CHEAH, CHARISSA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1283
 JUN 13, 2006
 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	5	3	4.38	708/1481	4.38	4.24	4.29	4.28	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.23	4.23	4.11	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.24	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	595/1424	4.38	4.22	4.21	4.16	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	403/1396	4.38	4.00	3.98	4.00	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.10	4.07	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.21	4.16	4.01	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	6	0	3.86	1427/1480	3.86	4.69	4.68	4.74	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	599/1450	4.29	4.03	4.09	3.96	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.41	4.42	4.36	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	311/1399	4.71	4.28	4.26	4.16	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	681/1400	4.43	4.26	4.27	4.17	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	323/1179	4.43	3.95	3.96	3.81	4.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	345/1262	4.50	3.90	4.05	4.07	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.24	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	272/1256	4.83	4.30	4.30	4.33	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	89/ 788	4.80	3.89	4.00	3.97	4.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.84	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.74	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.66	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.52	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.04	3.92	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

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