Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101

Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SCH

Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN Enrollment: 15

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2002

Page 468 JUN 11, 2002 Job IRBR3029

				Fr	eque	ncies			Ins	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Questions		NR	NA		2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights, skills	from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	702/1	398	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.29	4.36
		ctor make clear th		0	0	1	2	3	3	5		1196/1		3.64	4.33	4.21		3.64
		estions reflect t		0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1	175	****	4.37	4.26	4.26	****
		ations reflect th		1	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	769/1	338	4.15	4.47	4.20	4.23	4.15
			to what you learned	0	2	3	0	3	1	5	3.42	1134/1	338	3.42	4.11	4.03	4.02	3.42
			te to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	3	7	3.86	883/1	289	3.86	4.38	4.07	4.07	3.86
		system clearly e		0	0	4	1	1	1	7	3.43	1237/1	384	3.43	4.36	4.18	4.17	3.43
		was class cancell		0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	805/1	394	4.79	4.80	4.68	4.70	4.79
			teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	895/1	375	3.92	4.29	4.06	4.08	3.92
		Lecture																
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures w	ell prepared	0	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	984/1	335	4.14	4.46	4.39	4.40	4.14
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem interest	ed in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1:	340	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.70	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented a	nd explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	820/1	338	4.21	4.47	4.27	4.28	4.21
4. Did th	e lecture	s contribute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	878/1:	334	4.14	4.42	4.26	4.29	4.14
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enhan	ce your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	424/1	136	4.15	3.93	3.90	3.92	4.15
		Discussio	n															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribute	to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	468/12	216	4.36	4.52	4.02		4.36
2. Were a	11 studer	its actively encou	raged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	305/13	223	4.79	4.71	4.30	4.32	4.79
3. Did th	e instruc	tor encourage fai	r and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57			4.57		4.26	4.29	4.57
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques successf	ul	0	4	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	173/	762	4.50	4.27	3.99	4.03	4.50
		Laborator	у															
1. Did th	e lab inc	rease understandi	ng of the material	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	82/ :	182	4.36	3.43	4.25	4.16	4.36
2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequate	background information	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	33/ :	185	4.79	3.64	4.28	4.26	4.79
3. Were n	ecessary	materials availab	le for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	21/	181	4.93	4.46	4.35	4.33	4.93
4. Did th	e lab ins	tructor provide a	ssistance	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	37/	176	4.79	4.14	4.35	4.32	4.79
5. Were r	equiremen	its for lab report	s clearly specified	1	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	28/	167	4.71	3.36	4.16	3.92	4.71
		Field Wor	k															
1. Did fi	eld exper	ience contribute	to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	36/	49	4.31	4.65	4.52	4.57	4.31
2. Did yo	u clearly	understand your	evaluation criteria	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	31/	48	4.15	4.38	4.37		4.15
3. Was th	e instruc	tor available for	consultation	2	3	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	32/	47	4.44	4.68	4.60	4.37	
4. To wha	t degree	could you discuss	your evaluations	2	3	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	37/		3.33	4.21			3.33
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry o	ut field activities	2	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/	40	4.83	4.16	4.27	4.22	4.83
		Self Pac																
			to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0			****/	25		****		4.11	****
2. Did st	udy quest	ions make clear t	he expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	19	****	****	4.68	4.11	
			Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons					тур	е			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Gradu	ate		0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1															
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 2 C 1					Ger	nera	1				0	Under	-gr	ad 1	4	Non-	major	1
84-150 5 3.00-3.49 5 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 5 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	####	- M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
			P 0									respo	nse	s to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
	I 0				Oth	her				1	3							

Course-Section: EDUC 332 0101

Title SCIENCE:SECONDARY SCHO
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2002

Page 470 JUN 11, 2002 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncie	g		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.29	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1397			4.21	4.23	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1338	5.00	4.47	4.20	4.23	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1338	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1289	5.00	4.38	4.07	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384		4.36	4.18	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1394		4.80			5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	172/1375	4.67	4.29	4.06	4.08	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1335	5.00	4.46	4.39	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1340	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1338	5.00	4.47	4.27	4.28	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1334	5.00	4.42	4.26	4.29	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1136	5.00	3.93	3.90	3.92	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1216	5.00	4.52	4.02	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1223	5.00	4.71	4.30	4.32	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1223	5.00	4.69	4.26	4.29	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 762	5.00	4.27	3.99	4.03	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.76	4.74	4.79	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	59/ 67	4.33	4.72	4.70	4.71	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.69	4.59	4.64	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.83	4.62	4.65	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 74	5.00	4.56	4.18	3.87	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 49	5.00	4.65	4.52	4.57	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.38	4.37	4.33	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.68	4.60	4.37	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.16	4.27	4.22	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2002 Page 495 JUN 11, 2002 Job IRBR3029

HI OII I MCHC.					
uestionnaires:	2	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	eaner	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	имвс	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA		2		4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	1001/1398	4 00	4 44	4 27	4.45	4.00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	0			1394/1397		4.33		4.28	2.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		1296/1338		4.47			3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0		1314/1338	2.50		4.03	4.16	2.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1			1268/1289	2.50	4.38	4.07	4.23	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0			1360/1384	2.50	4.36	4.18	4.19	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	7 () ()		994/1394			4.68	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	C () ()		761/1375	4.00			4.12	4.00
y. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1331/1335	2.00	4.46		4.49	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1240/1340	4.00	4.89	4.70	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	1	-	A THE STATE OF THE	1320/1338		4.47	4.27	4.38	2.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1			1311/1334		4.42	4.26	4.32	2.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	496/1136	4.00	3.93	3.90	3.94	4.00
Discussion										2 50	4 50	4 02	4 10	2 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1			1166/1216				4.18	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	V	A CONTRACTOR OF STREET	852/1223					3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0			1141/1223 745/ 762			4.26	4.04	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	745/ 762	2.00	4.27	3.99	4.04	2.00
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2 50	182/ 182	2.50	3.43	4.25	4.54	2.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	183/ 185			4.28	4.47	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	136/ 181			4.35	4.68	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	163/ 176				4.54	3.50
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	166/ 167			4.16	4.44	2.00
3. Held requirements for tab reports creatify specific														
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	38/ 49	4.00	4.65	4.52	4.62	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.00	4.38	4.37		4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47			4.60		4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 45	4.00	4.21	4.23	4.28	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	tion										

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means t	here	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to b	e sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101

Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2002

Page 498 JUN 11, 2002 Job IRBR3029

	아니는 이번 중요 가다는 것 하면 하는 사람들이 되면 되었다. 역사하지만 하게 바꾸어지만 하지만 하는 하나라면 하는 사람이 없는 사람이 없는 것이다.							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	4.50	512/1398	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.45	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	Chica 2 7 11	4.00	964/1397			4.21		4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	403/1338		4.47		4.30	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50				4.03	4.16	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	A	4.50	280/1289		4.38	4.07	4.23	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	945/1384	4.00	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1394	5.00	4.80	4.68	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.29	4.06	4.12	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	685/1335	4.50	4.46	4.39	4.49	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1340	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	938/1338	4.00	4.47	4.27	4.38	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	559/1334	4.50	4.42	4.26	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	823/1136	3.50	3.93	3.90	3.94	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	336/1216	4.50			4.18	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1223		4.71		4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	537/1223	4.50				4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	173/ 762	4.50	4.27	3.99	4.04	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	49/ 67					
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 67			4.70		5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.50	39/ 67	4.50		4.59	4.64	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 70		4.83	4.62	4.70	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 74	4.50	4.56	4.18	4.42	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	32/ 49	4.50	4.65	4.52	4.62	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.00	4.38	4.37	4.49	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.68	4.60	4.78	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 45	4.00	4.21	4.23		4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 40	4.00	4.16	4.27	4.44	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ition	1									

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

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Fall 2001

Page 550 JAN 23, 2002 Job IRBR3029

				Fr	equer	ncies			Ing	tructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Questions	NR	NA		2		4	5				Mean		Mean	Mean
	General														
	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0			713/1489					
	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	. 1	4.00					4.18	4.00
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	0	1		1231/1272			4.24		3.00
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1			1175/1401					3.67
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	748/1412					4.00
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	434/1348	4.33	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.33
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	953/1473	4.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.00
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.76	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	477/1472	4.33	4.14	4.02	4.16	4.33
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1364/1408	3.00	4.48	4.36	4.46	3.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412		4.85		4.77	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	0		1332/1404	3.00				3.00
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0		1314/1402		4.40			3.00
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	0		1193/1214		3.97			2.00
	Did addressing teemingdes emance your understanding	•							2.00	1175,1211	2.00				
	Discussion														
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1184/1344	3.00	4.42	3.94	4.06	3.00
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1231/1337	3.00	4.58	4.18	4.35	3.00
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	841/1335	4.00	4.59	4.18	4.36	4.00
	Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	405/ 837	4.00	4.24	3.97	4.05	4.00

Frequency I	Dis	tri	buti	on
-------------	-----	-----	------	----

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

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101

Questionnaires: 18

Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SCH

Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN Enrollment: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2001

Page 517 JAN 23, 2002 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						Fr	eque	ncies	5		Ins	truc	tor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questio	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	Rank				Mean	Mean
		Gener	21																
1. Did	you gain ne	ew insights sk	ille fr	om this course															
2. Did	the instruc	tor make clea	r the ex	om this course	0	0	2	2	0	7	7	3.83	117	5/1489	3.83	4.37	4.23	4.23	3.83
3. Did t	the exam gr	estions refle	at the	xpected goals	0	0	1	3	5	3	6	3.56	127	8/1489	3.56	4.34	4.16	4.14	3.56
4. Did	other evalu	ations reflec	t the	expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	***	*/1272	****	4.50	4.24	4.21	****
5. Did a	assigned re	adings senteil	t the ex	what you learned	0	1	3	0	3	6	5	3.59	121	3/1401	3.59	4.34	4.17	4.16	3.59
6. Did v	written age	ignments	oute to	what you learned	0	1	2	3	1	7	4	3.47	113	5/1412		4.00	4.01	3.98	3.47
7. Was t	the grading	system clear:	ribute t	o what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	4	5			4/1348		4.33	4.05	4.03	3.53
8 How m	nany times	was class can	ry expla	lined	0	0	4	2	2	3				2/1473			4.16		3.39
9 How w	any cimes	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00		1/1487			4.64	4.62	5.00
J. HOW W	vould you g	rade the overa	all teac	ching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	7	3				9/1472					
														,	3.07	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.67
1 Were	the instance	Lectur	e																
2 Did b	the instru	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	***	/1408	****	4.48	4.36		
2. Did t	ne instruc	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	3			/1412	****			4.31	****
J. Was I	ecture mat	erial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	2			/1404	****	4.85	4.67	4.65	****
4. DIG C	ne recture	S contribute t	o what	vou learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2			/1404	****		4.20	4.16	****
o. Did a	udiovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	3			/1214		4.40	4.21	4.18	****
												3.00		/1214		3.97	3.84	3.82	****
		Discus	sion																
1. Did c	lass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	3	2 00	704	11211					
z. were	all studen	ts actively en	COUTAGE	d to narticinate	10	0	0	2	0	1	5	4 12	784	/1344	3.88		3.94		3.88
3. Dia t	ne instruc	tor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	10	0	2	0	1	1				/1337	4.13		4.18	4.17	4.13
4. Were	special te	chniques succe	ssful		10	2	0	1	0	3	4	3.63	1082	/1335	3.63	4.59	4.18	4.17	3.63
					10	-	U	1	U	3	2	4.00	405	/ 837	4.00	4.24	3.97	3.96	4.00
		Field	Work																
1. Did f	ield exper:	ience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	16	0													
Z. Diu y	ou clearly	understand vo	ur eval	nation aritaria	16	0	0	0	1	1		3.50			****	4.43	3.83	3.97	****
J. Was L.	ne instruct	tor available	for con	gultation			0	1	0	1		3.00			****	4.50	3.97	3.87	****
4. To wh	at degree d	could you disc	neg von	r evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	* * * *	/ 41	****	4.53	4.33	4.52	****
		you albe	uss you.	evaluations	16	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	* * * *	/ 40	****	4.46	4.20	4.32	****
				Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	tion											
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA																	
		Cum. GFA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	е		,	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0																
28-55	1	1.00-1.99		A 10		Req	uire	d fo	r Maj	ors	0)	Gr	aduate	0		Major		0
56-83	3		0	B 8													ajoi		·
84-150	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gen	eral				0		Un	der-gr	ad 18		Non-n	naior	3
Grad.	0	3.00-3.49	8	D 0										3-			11011-11	.0101	3
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Elec	ctive	es			0		##	## - M	eans th	ere av	0 201	anauch	
P 0													re	sponse	s to be	cie al	figant	enough	
	I 0					Othe	er				17		10.	ponse	s co be	signi	Licant		
						C. Carlotte	Physical Co.				- '								

0

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101

Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 14

Ouestionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2001

Page 434 JUN 16, 2001 Job IRBR3029

Questionnuites			Fre	auer	cies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1				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			341/1315				4.32	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6		4.45	483/1315	4.45	4.35	4.21	4.23	****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0			****/1127	****		4.28	4.31	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	Andrew Control of	4.40	487/1257		4.47	4.19		4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8		4.09	635/1266	4.09	4.21	4.05	4.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5		4.18	545/1177		4.33	4.08		3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	2		3.90	999/1306		4.38	4.20		5.00
7. Was the grading system crearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1315			4.66		
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	273/1306	4.50	4.22	4.07	4.11	4.50
Lecture	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.57		4.46	
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1261	5.00	4.88	4.70		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.48	4.27		5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1253	5.00	4.53	4.28		5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	105/1073	4.75	4.05	3.91	3.98	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding		U	·											
Discussion					0	-	-	4.71	214/1152	4 71	4.55	4.04	4.14	4.71
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3		4.57			4.72		4.35	
were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	Carl Carlotte	0		5.00	1/1150		4.68	4.29		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1		4.86	91/ 703		4.32	4.04		4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	U	1	0	4.00	31, 703					
Field Work									33/ 45	4 00	4 37	4 36	4.32	4.00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	Man Maria	4.00	/		3.94	4.02		3.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	0	2	Service States	3.50			4.55	4.53		4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	0	1		4.67	23/ 38		4.37	4.36		3.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	1	0	1	7	3.67	36/ 40			4.40		
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	31/ 34	3.33	4.52	4.40	4.41	3.33
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	s

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
00-27	0	1.00-1.99	0 2	B 1 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	0
56-83 84-150 Grad.	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0 F 0	Electives	0			re not enough	
Grad.	Ů			P 0	Other	10	responses to	be sign.	illeane	

Title SCIENCE:SECONDARY SCHO
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 4
Questionnaires: 3 Studen

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2001

Page 436 JUN 16, 2001 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	2	4.67	312/1315	4.67	4.48	4.25	4.32	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3			912/1315					
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	568/1257	4.33	4.47	4.19	4.25	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	438/1266	4.33	4.21	4.05	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	423/1177	4.33	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1104/1306	3.67	4.38	4.20	4.18	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	802/1315	4.67	4.82	4.66	4.67	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	739/1306	4.00	4.22	4.07	4.11	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1019/1262	4.00	4.57	4.42	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1261	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.48	4.27	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1186/1253	3.00	4.53	4.28	4.30	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	498/1073	4.00	4.05	3.91	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	. 0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1152	5.00	4.55	4.04	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1153	5.00	4.72	4.29	4.35	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1150	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.35	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	170/ 703	4.50	4.32	4.04	4.13	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2001

Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 2
Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 455 JUN 16, 2001 Job IRBR3029

			P		ncies			Tna	tructor	Course	Dent	IIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	4	3		5		Rank	Mean			Mean	Mean
General												7777		
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	452/1315	4.50	4.48	4.25	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1166/1315	3.50	4.35	4.21	4.30	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	355/1257	4.50	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	684/1266	4.00	4.21	4.05	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	277/1177	4.50	4.33	4.08	4.24	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	910/1306	4.00	4.38	4.20		4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1315			4.66	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	273/1306	4.50	4.22	4.07	4.24	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1019/1262	4.00	4.57	4.42	4.54	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1261	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.79	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1253		4.53		4.39	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	498/1073	4.00	4.05	3.91	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50						4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00		5.00			4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1150				4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	170/ 703	4.50	4.32	4.04	4.00	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	33/ 45					4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0.00	4.00	27/ 45			4.02		4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 38					5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	40/ 40					2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	32/ 34	3.00	4.52	4.40	4.50	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	ıtio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			ту	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101 Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S
Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County

spring 2001 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 459 JUN 16, 2001 Job IRBR3029

Outstions Outstions Outstions Outstions Outstions Outstions NX NA 1 2 2 8 8 8 8 1 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		cour	se	Eva]	luat	ion	Ques	sti	0000						JUN 16	, 2001
2. Did the same insights skall from this course 1. Did the same course make clear the expected foliate of the same course is a state of the same course of the same course is a state of the same course o	[25] 이 사람이 하는 아이는 아이를 하는데 얼마나 아는 사람들이 얼마나 아니는 아이를 가득하는 수 있는데 아이를 하는데 아이를 하는데 아이를 하는데 아이를 하는데 되었다고 있다.									ire					JOD IF	BR3029
S. Did described explorations prince: the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 731/135 4.25 4.48 4.25 4.40 4.25 6. Did written explored goals 0 2 0 0 1 1 1 2 4.25 731/135 4.25 4.48 4.25 4.40 4.25 6. Did written gradings contribute appeared goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 1/1127 4.25 4.36 4.25 4.40 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	1. Did you		NR	NA	F .	requ	enci	es			•					
S. Did described explorations prince: the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 731/135 4.25 4.48 4.25 4.40 4.25 6. Did written explored goals 0 2 0 0 1 1 1 2 4.25 731/135 4.25 4.48 4.25 4.40 4.25 6. Did written gradings contribute appeared goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 1/1127 4.25 4.36 4.25 4.40 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	2. Did the insights skill					2	3		4	5 Me	instructor	Course	Dont			
S. Did described explorations prince: the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.25 731/135 4.25 4.48 4.25 4.40 4.25 6. Did written explored goals 0 2 0 0 1 1 1 2 4.25 731/135 4.25 4.48 4.25 4.40 4.25 6. Did written gradings contribute appeared goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5.00 1/1127 4.25 4.36 4.25 4.40 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.25 73 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	3. Did the extructor make clear the from this course										Rank	Mean	Мере	UMBC	Level	Sect
6. Did writing dreadings consensible expected goals of 2 0 0 1 1 2 4.58 734/1315 4.25 4.46 4.25 4.40 4.25 4.00 4.25 4.10 4.25 4.10 4.25 4.26 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20 4.20	4. Did other am questions reflect the expected goals		0	0	0	0									mean	Mean
7. Was the passignments accidition to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5. Did assigned auations reflect the expected goals		0	0	100 Y 100 Y	0	1		1	2 4	25 70					
B. How many fixes a year clarification to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 3.00 1/1127 5.00 4.33 4.21 4.30 4.35 9. How would like you have you many fixes you have you many fixes you have you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1.50 107/1376 4.75 4.47 4.29 4.75 4.76 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75 4.75	6. Did written readings contribute expected goals		0	2	CAN LAST THE	0	1		1	2 4	25 /34/1315	4.25	1 10			
9. Now would you grade the overal led 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1.50 1.53/1257 4.79 4.79 4.27 4.18 5.08 5.09 4.21 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70 4.70	7. Was the assignments contribute to what you leave		0	0		RESIDENCE VALUE	0		0	2 5	00 /05/1315	4.25	4.48	4.25	4.40	4 25
Lecture Lect	8. How many system clearly to what you los		0				0									
Lecture Lect	9. How would class class carry explained	i	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1 3 6	50 155/1257	4.75	4 47	4.28	4.38	5 00
1. Were the instructor Locture	you grade the Oversilled		0	0	0	0	2	1	1	1 3 5	1037/1266	3.50	4 . 4 /	4.19	4.28	4 75
2. Did the sinstructor's lecture well prepared 3. Was lecture troops against the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.00 1019/1262 4.00 4.25 4.25 4.06 4.81 4.50 4. Did the sinstructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.00 1019/1262 4.00 4.25 4.25 4.07 4.24 4.25 4. Did the lecture trial presented and the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.07 1019/1262 4.00 4.25 4.25 4.26 4.07 4.27 4.25 4. Did the lecture trial presented and subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 4.07 1019/1262 4.00 4.25 4.25 4.26 4.25 4.25 5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance you understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 6.07 844/1261 4.67 4.28 4.54 4.00 4.07 4.79 4.67 5. Did class discursions Discussion 1. Did class discursions Discussion 2. Were all students one Contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	overall teaching effective	(0	0	0	0	2	0)	2 4 0	882/1177	3.75	4.21	4.05	4.20	3 50
3. Was lectime seem interested by prepared 4. Did the laterial presented on the subject 5. Did audiovinuit techniques enhance your understanding 6. Did audiovinuit techniques enhance your understanding 7. Did class discussions 8. Did audiovinuit techniques enhance your understanding 8. Did audiovinuit techniques enhance your understanding 8. Did audiovinuit techniques enhance your understanding 8. Did class discussions 9. Did audiovinuit techniques enhance your understanding 9. O 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Were the the Lecture	(0	0	0	0	0	2		2 4 5	910/1306	4.00	4 . 3 3	4.08	4.24	3 75
A Did electure material presented and the subject 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1019/1262 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.08 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05 4.05	2 Dia - MacFuctoria :				·	0	0	3	1	1 4 2	895/1315	4.50	4.38	4.20	4.29	4 00
5. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 4.00 1019/1262 4.00 4.57 4.42 4.54 4.00 additional techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 3.67 144/1261 4.67 4.88 4.04 4.79 4.67 4.89 4.07 4.79 4.67 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	3. Was lecturator seem inter well prepared									1.2	5 532/1306	4.25	4.82	4.66	4.81	4.00
1		1		0	0								1.22	4.07	4.24	4.50
Discussion Discussion Discussion	5. Did and lectures contributed and explained of	1		0			1	1	1	1 0						4.25
Discussion Discussion Discussion	addiovisual techniques to what you learnly	1					0	1	2	4.00	0 1019/1262	4 00				
Discussion	ennance vous	1		0	0	0	1	2	0	2.67	844/1261	4 67	. 57	.42	4.54	1 00
2. Were all discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did the insteaders actively sout to what you learned 4. Were special techniques sourceseful 2. Did the instructor encourage for participate 4. Were special techniques sourcessful 2. Did the instructor encourage for participate 4. Were special techniques sourcessful 2. Did the instructor encourage for participate 4. Were special techniques sourcessful 2. Did the instructor encourage for participate 4. Were special techniques sourcessful 2. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were you provided with dequate background information 3. Did provide with a swallable for lab activities 3. Did provide assistance 3. Did presentations 4. Did field experience Field Work 4. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 3. Did presentations 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Did presentations 3. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 4. Did self-paced system	1 Dia	1		0	0	0	0	2	1	1.67	1084/1256	3 67 4	.88 4	.70 4	1.79	4.00
4. Mere apscial instructor encouraged to participate of the material and open discussion of the material and open discussion of the material and open discussion of the material of the decision of the material open discussion open discussi	2 War discussions				U	0	1	2	0	4.33	679/1253	1 33	. 48 4	.27 4	. 38	4.67
4. Mere apscial instructor encouraged to participate of the material and open discussion of the material and open discussion of the material and open discussion of the material of the decision of the material open discussion open discussi	3. Did the students actively to what you								U	3.67	724/1073	67	.53 4	.28 4	.30	3.67
Laboratory Labora	4. Were an instructor encouraged to next learned	1	0									.07 4	.05 3	.91 3	98	± . 33
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1.00 166/166 1.00 4.75 4.04 4.09 4.25 4. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 3. 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/169 5.00 4.55 4.18 4.00 4.25 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3. 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/169 5.00 4.55 4.18 4.00 4.25 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme assigned topic of the material assigned topics relevant to the announced theme assigned topic of the material assistance of the material assigned topic of the material assistance of the material assigned topic of the material assigned topic of the material assistance of the ma	special techniques care fair and open di-	0				U	0	0	3							0 /
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 1 4.25 298/703 4.25 4.04 4.29 4.55 5.00 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 0 0 1 1 4.25 298/703 4.25 4.68 4.29 4.55 4.25 3. Were necessary materials adapted background information 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/169 5.00 4.13 4.10 4.13 1.00 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/169 5.00 4.57 4.18 4.06 5.00 2. Ware assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/169 5.00 4.57 4.18 4.06 5.00 3. Did research the relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/169 5.00 4.57 4.38 4.06 5.00 3. Did research the relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/169 5.00 4.57 4.88 4.06 5.00 3. Did research the relevant to the announced theme 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 161/162 1.00 4.07 4.33 4.55 5.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 57/69 4.00 4.48 4.57 4.54 4.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 57/69 4.00 4.48 4.57 4.54 4.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	decessful	0	2 30 1 7		1000	0	0	-	W	3.00	1/11					
#### - Means by provided with adequate background information 3 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0						0	7			5.00	1/1153 5	.00 4.	55 4	. 04 4	20 -	
Set the lab instructor provide assistance 3	2. Were lab increase und			0		0	0	3	1	4.25	677/1150 4	.00 4.	72 4	.29 4	55 5	.00
Set the lab instructor provide assistance 3	3. Were you provided with a standing of the mai								-	4.25	298/ 703 4	25 4.	68 4.	29 4	55 5	.00
Less the lab instructor provide assistance lab activities 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 166/ 166 1.00 4.13 4.10 4.13 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	4. Did thecessary material	3	0									25 4.	32 4.	04 4	00 4	. 25
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/169 5.00 4.55 4.18 4.06 5.00 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4	the lab instructor available for lab		W. 11. 7) ()	0	0						00 4	. 25
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 7. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 8. Did you clearly understand your evaluations 8. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 9. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 9. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 9. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 9. Reasons Expected Grades Expected	assistance	3	•	0		0		0	1	1.00	166/ 166					
As the instructor available for individual attention 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 57/ 69 4.00 4.23 4.54 5.00 and present projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/ 69 4.00 4.423 4.54 5.00 and present projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.66 5.00 and present projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 60 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.66 5.00 and present projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 70 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.66 5.00 and present projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 70 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.66 5.00 and present projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 70 5.00 4.37 4.36 4.55 4.54 4.00 and present projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 42/ 45 2.00 4.37 4.36 4.30 4.00 and present projects contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			0	0	0	0	(0	1	5.00	1/ 169 5	00 4.3	13 4.	10 4	12 .	
#### - Means at 100 4.23 4.05 1.00 1. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 69 4.00 4.48 4.57 4.54 4.00 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.66 5.00 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 70 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.66 5.00 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3 0 0 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 70 5.00 4.53 4.55 4.54 4.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 42/ 45 2.00 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 5. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 29 5.00 5.00 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 6. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 29 5.00 5.00 4.37 4.36 4.30 5.00 7. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 29 5.00 5.00 4.37 4.36 4.30 5.00 8. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 29 5.00 5.00 4.66 4.68 5.00 8. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 29 5.00 5.00 4.66 4.68 5.00 8. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 29 5.00 5.00 4.66 4.68 5.00 8. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 28 5.00 5.00 4.66 4.68 5.00 8. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2. Was assigned topics relative			1	0	0)	0	5.00	1/ 161 5	00 4.5	5 4.	18 4	06 5	00
The first for grading made clear you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 57/ 69 4.00 4.48 4.57 4.54 4.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 4.53 4.66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 60 5.00	3. Did ne instructor available to the announced									1.00	161/ 162 1	00 4.7	7 4.	33 4	54 5.	00
The first for grading made clear you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 57/ 69 4.00 4.48 4.57 4.54 4.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 4.53 4.66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 60 5.00	4. Did research projects control for individual	3	0									4.0	0 4.2	23 4 (05 3	00
The first for grading made clear you learned 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 57/ 69 4.00 4.48 4.57 4.54 4.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 4.53 4.66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 66 5.00 1/ 60 5.00	5. Were resentations Contribute to what was	3	0	0	0	0	1		0						3 1.	00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/70 5.00 4.53 4.55 4.64 5.00 2.00 4.57 4.68 4.66 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.68 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.68 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.68 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.68 5.00 4.57 4.68 4.58 4.59 4.68 4.68 5.00 4.57 4.58 4.53 4.00 4.57 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.59 4.58 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59 4.59	criteria for grading to what von learned	3									57/ 60					
1. Did field experience Contribute to what you learned 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/70 5.00 4.33 4.55 4.54 4.00 4.00 4.53 4.55 4.54 4.00 4.53 4.55 4.54 4.00 4.53 4.55 4.54 4.00 4.53 4.55 4.54 4.00 4.53 4.55 4.54 4.00 4.53 4.55 4.54 4.00 4.53 4.55 4.54 4.00 4.55 4.56 4.00 4.57 4.68 4.66 5.00 6.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4	made clear	3		0	0	0	1		0	0.00	1/ 66 5	4.4	8 4.5	7 4 5	4	
4. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 42/ 45 2.00 4.37 4.36 3.90 1.00 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 3 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 42/ 45 2.00 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 4. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 40 5.00 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 4.37 4.36 4.30 5.00	1 2			0	0	0	0									
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 40 5 0 0 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 40 5 0 0 4.37 4.36 4.30 5.00 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.75 4.43 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.75 4.43 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.75 4.43 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.66 4.68 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.66 4.68 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.66 4.68 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.66 4.68 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.66 4.68 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2. Did field experience contell work		0	1	0	0	0		0 1	.00	1/ 70 5 0	0 4.53	4.5	5 4 5	0 5.(0
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 40 5 0 0 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 4 0 5 0 0 4.37 4.36 4.30 5.00 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 29 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.75 4.43 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 28 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.66 4.68 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 28 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.66 4.68 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0	4. To what you clearly understand to what you								0 1	.00	68/ 68 1 0	0 4.43	4.4	7 4 4	4 4.0	0
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 40 5 0 0 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 4 0 5 0 0 4.37 4.36 4.30 5.00 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 29 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.75 4.43 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 28 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.66 4.68 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 1 28 5 0 0 5 0 0 4.66 4.68 5 0 0 0 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0 1 2 0 0 0 0	what degree could your evaluation learned	3	0								1.0	3.93	4.04	4 3 00	5.0	0
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/40 5.00 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 2.00 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 4.37 4.36 4.30 5.00 4.37 4.36 4.30 6.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 6.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4	discuss your evaluation a														1.0	0
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 40 5.00 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 40 5.00 4.37 4.36 3.95 2.00 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 3 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 29 5.00 5.00 4.37 4.36 4.30 5.00 Credits Earned Frequency Distribution Cum. GPA Expected Grades 28-55 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 3 Reasons 56-83 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Majors Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means the	1 Dia		0	0	0	1	•	U	2	.00	42/ 15					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Cum. GPA Expected Grades B4-150 Conducts Conducts	2 Paced system Paced			0	0	0		1	3	.00	37/ 45 3 00	4.37	4.36	3.95		
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Reasons Type Majors Grad. 1 3.00-3.49 1 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Required for Majors Grad. 1 3.00-3.49 1 Cum. GPA Expected Grades Required for Majors General Frequency Distribution Required for Majors General Ounder-grad	3. Were study questions make all the to what you							-	5.	.00	1/ 40 5 00	3.94	4.02	3.67	2.0	0
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 1.00-1.99 0 A 3 84-150 0 2.00-2.99 0 B 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 3.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	your contacts with the expected learned	0		^							3.00	4.37	4.36	4.30	3.00)
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 1.00-1.99	the instructor helps			0	0	0	0	1	-						5.00	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons 1.00-1.99 0 A 3 84-150 0 2.00-2.99 0 B 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 3.50-4.00 2 F 0 P 0 Electives 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 4.75 4.43 5.00 1/ 28 5.00 5.00 4.75 4.43 5.00 1/ 28 5.00 5.00 4.66 4.68 5.00 Type Majors Ounder-grad 3 Non-major 0 #### - Means by	"etbiil	U		0	0	0		0	5.	0.0						
Cum. GPA	Cradi	0		0	0	0	0	1	4.	00 2	21/ 26 4 00	5.00	4.75	4 43		
Reasons 1.00-1.99 0 A 3 84-150 0 2.00-2.99 0 B 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Majors Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 D 0 General 0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 0 P 0 Electives 0 #### - Means by	Frequency	Di	0.4					-	5.	00	1/ 28 5 00	4.75	4.58	4 52	5.00	
Reasons 1.00-1.99 0 A 3 84-150 0 2.00-2.99 0 B 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Majors Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 D 0 General 0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 0 P 0 Electives 0 #### - Means by	00-27 Expert	215	oLT.	Ibut	ion						3.00	5.00	4.66	4.60	4.00	
Reasons 1.00-1.99 0 A 3 84-150 0 2.00-2.99 0 B 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Majors Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 2 D 0 General 0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 0 P 0 Electives 0 #### - Means by															5.00	
84-150 0 2.00-2.99 0 B 1 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 1 Majors 0 Graduate 1 Major 0 P 0 Electives 0 ### - Means by	56-83]	Reas	ons										
Grad. 1 3.00-3.49 1 C 0 Graduate 1 Majors 0 Graduate 1 Major 0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 0 P 0 Electives 0 ### - Means by	84-150 0 2.00-2.00 A 3	Po									Type					
3.50-4.00 2 D 0 General Graduate 1 Major 0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 0	Grad 3.00-2.49 0 B 1	w.e	qui	red	for	Maj	ors		0				A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR	Majora		
F 0 Under-grad 3 Non-major 0 P 0 Electives 0 #### - Means by	1 3.50-4.00 1	Ge	ne	- 1						G:	raduate	1				
P 0 Electives Under-grad 3 Non-major 0 #### - Means by	MRNING NEW MENT COUNTY CONTROL CONT	36	ner	al					1			1	Majo			
0 #### - Means - Non-major 0		FI	ent	4						Ur	nder-grad	2			0	
#### - Meang h	F 0			ives				0					Non-n	lajor		
responses to he are not enough								0		##	## - Means +				0	
										re	sponses to he	ere ar	e not	enough		
											00 11			4411		

0 Other

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101

Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2000

Page 494 JAN 22, 2001 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Quanting	NID	272			ncies		_	Y 2 THE	ructor	Course	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1		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	7	7	5	3.75	1152/1393	3.75	4.27	4.22	4.27	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	5	5	3.55	1207/1392	3.55	4.18	4.16	4.18	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	1	0	2	0		****/1168				4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	4	7			1174/1326				4.21	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	6	3	7		1024/1320		4.08		4.04	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1 5	4 2	6	6			1115/1260 1335/1376			4.03	4.04	3.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1			807/1392		4.19	4.15	4.11	2.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	6			735/1379		4.15		4.01	4.00
The second of th								1.00	73371373	4.00	1.13	1.02	1.01	1.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	912/1314	4.25	4.42	4.37	4.34	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	1		4.65						4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	8			928/1313			4.20	4.16	3.95
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	5			1120/1316			4.24		3.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	2	2	4	,	3.56	743/1097	3.56	3.93	3.83	3.87	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	2	5	7	3.63	881/1249	3.63	4.36	3.95	4.02	3.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	3		4.42	591/1246			4.23	4.28	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	625/1238	4.32	4.62	4.21	4.23	4.32
4. Were special techniques successful	1	6	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	419/ 738	3.92	4.20	3.97	4.05	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27 1 28-55 0	0.00-0.99 (HE NEW 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
56-83 2 84-150 10	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
Grad. 3	3.50-4.00 10	1) 보다 보고 있는데 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	Electives	0			re not enough	
		P 0	Other	19	responses to	be sign:	ificant	

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101

Title TCHNG SCIENCE: ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 21

Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2001

Page 517 JAN 23, 2002 Job IRBR3029

								-	ncies				tructor					Level	
		Question	18		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera			7777														
1 Did vo	, gain no			om this course	0	0	2	2	0	7	7	2 02	1175/1	100	2 02	1 27	1 22	1 22	3.83
		tor make clear			0	0	1	3	5	3			1278/1			4.34	4.16	4.14	3.56
				expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	3		****/1				4.24	4.21	****
		ations reflect			0	15	3	0	3	0	1000 YEAR TO BE		1213/1			4.34	4.17	4.16	3.59
				what you learned	0	1	2	3	1	7			1135/1		3.59		4.01		3.47
				to what you learned		1	1	3					1135/1				4.01		3.53
					0		4	3	4 2	4	45-1-17				3.53			4.03	3.39
		system clear		ained	0	0	0	2		3			1322/1					4.07	
		was class cand			0	0		0	0	0		5.00			5.00				
9. How wor	ila you g	rade the overa	ill tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	7	3	6	3.67	1119/1	472	3.67	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.67
		Lectur																	****
		ctor's lecture			16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1			4.48		4.31	****
				in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/1		****	4.85	4.67	4.65	****
				explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1		****		4.20	4.16	****
		s contribute t			16	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1		****		4.21	4.18	****
5. Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance	your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1	214	****	3.97	3.84	3.82	****
1 5/4 -1-		Discus											704/1				2 04	2 06	2 00
				what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3			784/1						3.88
				ed to participate	10	0	0	2	0	1			793/1					4.17	
				nd open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	1			1082/1		3.63			4.17	
4. were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssiul		10	2	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	405/	837	4.00	4.24	3.97	3.96	4.00
		Field																	
				what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	A STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE PAR		****/			4.43		3.97	****
				luation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	1			****/	51		4.50		3.87	****
		tor available			16	1	0	0	0	1			****/			4.53	Control of the Control of the Control	4.52	
4. To what	degree	could you disc	uss yo	ur evaluations	16	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/	40	****	4.46	4.20	4.32	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	tion	1										
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	oe .			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 10		Rec	quire	d fo	or Ma	jor	S	0	Grad	uate	3	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 8															
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Gen	neral					0	Unde	r-ar	ad 1	8	Non-	major	3

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expect	ed Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P.	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	17				
				2	0						

Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S University of Maryland BLUNCK, SUSAN Baltimore County Fall 2001

Page 550 JAN 23, 2002 Job IRBR3029

						ourse	Eva	luat	ion	Ques	tion	nai	re							Job II	RBR3029
1. Did	You gain	Quest					NA	F	requ	enci 3	00			structo		Cou	rse D	ent	IIMD	Level	
2. Did 3. Did	the instr	Gennew insights, actor make clear make clear make clear make clear make clear metrions refused in the control of the control o	skills f	rom this	Course									n Rai	nk 	Me	an M	ean	Mear	Level	Sect Mean
4 Did		duestions refi		receed	qoals	0	0	0	0	1	0		, , ,								
5. Did		uations refle	ach th	cybecred	goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	. 1	4.0	3 713/1 0 969/1 0 1231/1	1489	4 . :	33 4	. 37	4.23	4 24	
6. Did	written as	seadings contributions contributions con graystem clea	ibute to	what you	learned	0	0	0		0	0				272	4.	00 4	. 34	4.16	4.18	4.33
8. How .		J System Clas	w1		Ou learnes	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.6	7 1175/1	401	3.6	7 4	.50	4.24	4.18	3.00
9. How w	ould you	g system clea was class ca grade the	ncelled	ained		0	0	0	0	1	0	-	4.00	7/0/1	412	4.0	0 4	0.0		4.21	3.67
	you	was class ca grade the ove	rall tea	ching eff	0.01	0	0	0	1	0	0	-	4.00	434/1 953/1		4.3	3 4.	33	4.05	4.13	4.00
1 Ware		Leat		9 611	ectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0				4 / 3	4.0	0 4.	34	4.16	4.26	4.33
2. Did t	he instr	Lecturis lecturistor seem inte	res well								U	2	4.33	1/1	472	4.3	3 4	79	4.64	4.76	5.00
3. Was 1	ecture mat	ctor's lecturator seem interial present	rested	prepared		2	0	0						477/1				1.4	4.02	4.16	4.33
4. Did ti	he lecture	erial present s contribute techniques e	ed and e	explained	Dject	2	0	0	0	1 0	0	0		1364/14							
5. Did at	udiovisual	es contribute techniques e	to what	you learn	ned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	3.00	7/11	12	5.00	4.	4 8	4.36	4.46	3.00
			1	our under	standing	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1322/14	04	3.00	4 4	16	1 00	4.77	5.00
1. Did of		Discu	cai-				U	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1314/14	02	3.00	4.4	0	4.21	4.29	3.00
2. Were a	11 studen	Discu ssions contri ts actively en tor encourage	bute to	what you	learned									1193/12	14	2.00	3.9	7 3	3.84	3.87	2.00
4. Were	e instruc	ts actively extor encourage chniques succe	fair	d to part	icipate	2	0	0	0	1	0										2.00
	pecial te	tor encourage chniques succe	essful	d open di	scussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1184/13	4 4	3.00	4.4	2 3	3 94		
						2	0	0	0	0	1										3.00
Credits Ea					Freque						1	0	4.00	841/133 405/ 83	7	4.00	4.5	9 4	.18	4.36	4.00
	ined	Cum. GPA		P	Freque	ney I	Distr	ibut	ion								4.2	1 3	.97	4.05	4.00
00-27	1	0.00-0.99		Expecte	ed Grades				Reas												
28-55 56-83	0	1.00-1.99	0	A	2									Т	уре						
84-150	0	2.00-2.99	0	В	1		Requ	ired	for	Maj	ors	0							Ma	ajors	
Grad.	2	3.00-3.49	0	C D	0		Gene:							Gradua	te		2	N	Major		
		3.50-4.00	3	F	0							0		Under-	irad						0
				P	0		Elect	ive	S			0					1	N	Von-ma	jor	0
				I	0	(Other							#### - respons	Mea	ns th	nere .	are	not o		
				,	0		cher					3		respons	es	to be	sign	nifi	cant	nough	

Course-Section: EDUC 689 0201
Title ADV SPEC TOP IN EDUC
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2000

Page 513 JUL 10, 2000 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA		eque:	ncies 3		5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course			Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 3	0 0 3 0 0 0 0	1 1 2 1 1 2 0 1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2 0 0 0 1 3 0 1	6 6 5	16 14 11 13 12 13 12 19 12	4.55 4.55 4.29 4.50 4.35 4.45 5.00 4.47	399/1283 321/1283 569/1075 325/1220 386/1221 319/1157 768/1273 1/1281 293/1268	4.55 4.55 4.29 4.35 4.45 4.15 5.00 4.47	4.31 4.20 4.32 4.33 4.13 4.21 4.11 4.79 4.11	4.26 4.17 4.25 4.18 4.03 4.08 4.17 4.66 4.05	4.38 4.25 4.38 4.24 4.19 4.23 4.16 4.79 4.13	4.55 4.55 4.29 4.50 4.35 4.45 4.15 5.00 4.47
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 1 1 3	0 0 0 1 2	0 0 1 0 0	1 0 0 0 0	0 1 1 1 2	0 0 1 1 2	18 18 16 16	4.84 4.89 4.63 4.83 4.60	229/1221 426/1227 319/1219 170/1217 131/ 996	4.84 4.89 4.63 4.83 4.60	4.48 4.81 4.35 4.26 3.67	4.40 4.70 4.24 4.24 3.84	4.44 4.76 4.32 4.30 3.87	4.84 4.89 4.63 4.83 4.60
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1 1 2 2	0 0 0 1	0 0 0	0 1 0 0	1 0 1 0	4 2 3 4	14 16 14 13	4.68 4.74 4.72 4.76	176/1134 305/1136 308/1123 75/ 607	4.68 4.74 4.72 4.76	4.36 4.61 4.65 4.20	3.95 4.25 4.25 4.03	4.13 4.43 4.47 4.03	4.68 4.74 4.72 4.76
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1 2 1 1	4 0 2 1 4	1 0 1 1	1 0 1 0	1 0 0 0 0	2 2 3 2 3	10 14 14 14 14	4.27 4.50 4.82 4.50 4.53	71/ 177 47/ 183 24/ 174 73/ 172 54/ 163	4.27 4.50 4.82 4.50 4.53	4.31 4.08 4.57 4.40 4.38	4.05 4.17 4.30 4.24 4.12	4.01 4.10 4.12 4.27 4.13	4.27 4.50 4.82 4.50 4.53
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0 0 0 0	0 1 2 0 0	1 0 0 0 1	0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	3 4 4 3 2	16 14 14 17 15	4.65 4.63 4.78 4.85 4.45	39/ 63 28/ 58 23/ 54 21/ 60 19/ 60	4.65 4.63 4.78 4.85 4.45	4.51 4.19 4.40 4.51 3.73	4.70 4.55 4.54 4.60 3.95	4.57 4.38 4.41 4.50 3.87	4.65 4.63 4.78 4.85 4.45
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0	1 0 2 0 0	0 2 0 1 2	1 0 0 2 1	2 3 1 2 2	16 15 16 15 15	4.60 4.55 4.53 4.55 4.50	23/ 41 14/ 40 17/ 36 14/ 36 12/ 33	4.60 4.55 4.53 4.55 4.50	4.43 4.14 4.38 4.20 4.36	4.47 4.14 4.43 4.21 4.25	4.43 4.15 4.50 4.16 4.07	4.60 4.55 4.53 4.55 4.50
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4 4 4 4 4	0 1 0 2 2	1 1 1 1	0 1 1 0 1	1 1 0 0 0	1 0 1 3 1	13 12 13 10 11	4.56 4.40 4.50 4.50 4.43	8/ 20 6/ 14 7/ 16 8/ 14 6/ 13	4.56 4.40 4.50 4.50 4.43	4.09 4.23 4.33 4.37 4.38	4.19 4.09 4.23 4.21 4.19	3.94 3.91 4.00 4.03 4.18	4.56 4.40 4.50 4.50 4.43

Frequency Distribution

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Exp	ected Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27 28-55	3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	1		A 17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	16	Major	0
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99	00		C 0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	3
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00	13		F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means responses to		are not enough	
					I 0	Other	17	responses to	De SIG	milicant	

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2000 Page 497 JUL 10, 2000 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

		Ques	tions			NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5		ructor Rank	Course Mean			Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did othe 5. Did assi 6. Did wrif 7. Was the 8. How many	instructor exam quester evaluationed reaction tten assigned grading strong to the second seco	insights or make of stions ref tions ref tings cor gnments of system cl as class	lear flect lect tribu ontri early cance	the expe the exp the exp te to wh bute to explain lled	ected goals cted goals at you learned what you learned	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	0 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 1 0 0 1	0 1 0 0 1 1 1 1 0	1 2 0 1 1 1 0 1 2	2 1 1 2 2 2 2 3 1	4.00 4.00 5.00 4.00 4.25 4.25 3.75 4.75 3.75	914/1283 846/1283 1/1075 796/1220 474/1221 475/1157 1034/1273 730/1281 929/1268	4.00 4.00 5.00 4.00 4.25 4.25 3.75 4.75 3.75	4.31 4.20 4.32 4.33 4.13 4.21 4.11 4.79 4.11	4.26 4.17 4.25 4.18 4.03 4.08 4.17 4.66 4.05	4.38 4.25 4.38 4.24 4.19 4.23 4.16 4.79 4.13	4.00 4.00 5.00 4.00 4.25 4.25 3.75 4.75 3.75
4. Did the	instructo ure mater lectures	or's lector seem in ial pres	ntere ented te to	sted in and exp what yo	the subject lained clearly	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0	0 1 1 1 1	1 0 1 2 0	2 3 2 1 0	4.00 4.50 4.25 4.00 2.00	982/1221 971/1227 706/1219 841/1217 980/ 996	4.00 4.50 4.25 4.00 2.00	4.48 4.81 4.35 4.26 3.67	4.40 4.70 4.24 4.24 3.84	4.44 4.76 4.32 4.30 3.87	4.00 4.50 4.25 4.00 2.00
2. Were all	. students instructo	ions con activel r encour	y enc	te to wh ouraged air and	at you learned to participate open discussion	0	0 0 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	3332	4.50 4.50 4.50 4.33	262/1134 481/1136 470/1123 209/ 607	4.50 4.50 4.50 4.33	4.36 4.61 4.65 4.20	3.95 4.25 4.25 4.03	4.13 4.43 4.47 4.03	4.50 4.50 4.50 4.33
					Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	tior	1									
Credits Ear	ned	Cum.	GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Тур	е			Majors	
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150	1 0 0 0	0.00-0. 1.00-1. 2.00-2. 3.00-3.	99 99	0 0 0	A 2 B 1 C 0			quire neral		r Ma	jors		0	Graduate Under-g		2	Majo Non-	r major	0
Grad.	2	3.50-4.		1	D 0 F 0 P 0 I 0		E1e	ectiv ner	es				3	#### - N response	Means to be	here a e sign	re not ifican	enoug	h

Course-Section: EDUC 332 0101
Title SCIENCE:SECONDARY SCHO
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN Instructor: BLUN Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2000

Page 474 JUL 10, 2000 Job IRBR3029

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	quer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Me an	t ruc to i			Dept Mean		Level Mean	
2. Did the instru 4. Did other eval 5. Did assigned r 6. Did written as 7. Was the gradin 8. How many times	General ew insights, skills fro ctor make clear the ex uations reflect the ex eadings contribute to signments contribute g system clearly expla was class cancelled grade the overall tead	spected goals spected goals what you learned to what you learned ained	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	2 2 1 1 2 0 0	0 0 1 1 0 0 0 2	1 0 1 0 1 0 3 0	2.33 4.00 3.00 3.67	1121/1 1275/1 796/1 1125/1 915/1 1271/1 980/1	283 220 221 157 273 281	3.67 2.33 4.00 3.00 3.67 1.00 5.00 3.67	4.31 4.20 4.33 4.13 4.21 4.11 4.79 4.11	4.26 4.17 4.18 4.03 4.08 4.17 4.66 4.05	4.29 4.18 4.25 4.04 4.10 4.19 4.65 4.07	3.67 2.33 4.00 3.00 3.67 1.00 5.00 3.67
 Did the instru Was lecture ma Did the lectur 	Lecture uctor's lectures well ctor seem interested i terial presented and e es contribute to what l techniques enhance y	in the subject explained clearly you learned	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 1 1 1	1 0 2 2 0	1 3 0 0		982/1 1/1 1044/1 1020/1 944/	227 219 217	4.00 5.00 3.67 3.67 2.50	4.48 4.81 4.35 4.26 3.67	4.40 4.70 4.24 4.24 3.84	4.39 4.71 4.24 4.23 3.91	4.00 5.00 3.67 3.67 2.50
 Were all stude Did the instru 	Discussion ussions contribute to nts actively encourage ctor encourage fair ar echniques successful	d to participate	1 1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	1 0 0 0	1 2 2 1	4.50 5.00 5.00 4.00		136	4.50 5.00 5.00 4.00	4.36 4.61 4.65 4.20	3.95 4.25 4.25 4.03	4.06 4.33 4.35 4.10	4.50 5.00 5.00 4.00
 Was the instru Did research p Did presentati 	Seminar topics relevant to the ctor available for ind rojects contribute to ons contribute to what for grading made clear	lividual attention what you learned you learned	2 2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 0 1 1 0	5.00 3.00 5.00 5.00 1.00	1/ 58/ 1/ 1/ 60/	63 58 54 60	5.00 3.00 5.00 5.00 1.00	4.51 4.19 4.40 4.51 3.73	4.70 4.55 4.54 4.60 3.95	4.81 4.41 4.79 4.86 3.63	5.00 3.00 5.00 5.00 1.00
 Did you clearl Was the instru 	Field Work rience contribute to w y understand your eval ctor available for cor could you discuss you	uation criteria	2 2 2 2	0 0 0 0	0 1 0 1	0 0 1 0	1 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	3.00 1.00 2.00 1.00	40/ 40/ 36/ 36/	41 40 36 36	3.00 1.00 2.00 1.00	4.43 4.14 4.38 4.20	4.47 4.14 4.43 4.21	4.58 3.96 4.09 3.90	3.00 1.00 2.00 1.00
		Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	tion											
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 28-55 0	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 1 B 1		Req	uire	d fo	r Ma	jors		0	Grad	uate		0	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 84-150 1	2.00-2.99 0 3.00-3.49 1	C 0 D 0 F 0		Gen	eral					0	Unde	r-gr	ad	3	Non-	major	0
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 1	F O		Ele	ctiv	es				0			eans t				h
	ad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 P 0 I 0 2 1									3	resp	Ollae	3 (0 0	c sign	Tittall		

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101
Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Instructor: BLU Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2000

Page 502 JUL 10, 2000 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rar		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 2	0 0 7 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0	0 3 0 3 1 1 1 3 0	4 3 1 2 3 3 0 2 3	4 1 0 3 2 3 1 5 3	4.00 4.00 3.86 4.29	450/1 1114/1 ****/1 796/1 812/1 445/1 1215/1 762/1 261/1	1283 1075 1220 1221 1157 1273 1281	4.50 3.50 **** 4.00 3.86 4.29 2.83 4.71 4.50	4.31 4.20 4.32 4.33 4.13 4.21 4.11 4.79 4.11	4.26 4.17 4.25 4.18 4.03 4.08 4.17 4.66 4.05	4.38 4.25 4.38 4.24 4.19 4.23 4.16 4.79 4.13	4.50 3.50 **** 4.00 3.86 4.29 2.83 4.71 4.50
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0 0 2 0 0	0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0	0 0 3 2 5	5 0 2 3 1	2 8 1 3 0	4.00 5.00 3.67 4.13 3.17	982/1 1/1 1044/1 792/1 824/	227 219 217	4.00 5.00 3.67 4.13 3.17	4.48 4.81 4.35 4.26 3.67	4.40 4.70 4.24 4.24 3.84	4.44 4.76 4.32 4.30 3.87	4.00 5.00 3.67 4.13 3.17
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	0000	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 2	2 0 0 2	6 8 8 3	4.75 5.00 5.00 3.88		136	4.75 5.00 5.00 3.88	4.36 4.61 4.65 4.20	3.95 4.25 4.25 4.03	4.13 4.43 4.47 4.03	4.75 5.00 5.00 3.88
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33333	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 3 0 0 2	3 1 0 1	2 1 5 4 1	4.40 3.60 5.00 4.80 3.20	53/ 56/ 1/ 23/ 51/	63 58 54 60	4.40 3.60 5.00 4.80 3.20	4.51 4.19 4.40 4.51 3.73	4.70 4.55 4.54 4.60 3.95	4.57 4.38 4.41 4.50 3.87	4.40 3.60 5.00 4.80 3.20
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	666666	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	2 2 2 2 2 2	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/ 1/ 1/ 1/ 1/	41 40 36 36 36 33	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.43 4.14 4.38 4.20 4.36	4.47 4.14 4.43 4.21 4.25	4 · 43 4 · 15 4 · 50 4 · 16 4 · 07	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtion											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1 A 8 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		Req	uire	d fo	r Maj	ors)	Grad	uate		5	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0		Gen	eral					1	Unde	r-gr	ad :	3	Non-	major	0
56-83			ctiv	es)			eans the				h
I 0		Oth	er					7							

Course-Section: EDUC 792P 0201 Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2000

Page 525 JUL 10, 2000 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN Enrollment: 3
Questionnaires: 3

				4		0								
Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins! Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1	0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0		0 0 0 0 0 2 0	2 2 0 1 3 1 0 0	1 1 2 2 0 0 1 3 1	4.33 4.33 5.00 4.67 4.00 3.33 3.50 5.00 4.50	663/1283 576/1283 1/1075 204/1220 655/1221 1039/1157 1111/1273 1/1281 261/1268	4.33 5.00 4.67 4.00 3.33 3.50 5.00	4.31 4.20 4.32 4.33 4.13 4.21 4.11 4.79 4.11	4.26 4.17 4.25 4.18 4.03 4.08 4.17 4.66 4.05	4.38 4.25 4.38 4.24 4.19 4.23 4.16 4.79 4.13	4.33 4.33 5.00 4.67 4.00 3.33 3.50 5.00 4.50
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	00000	2 3 3 0	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 1.50	1/1221 1/1227 1/1219 1/1217 994/ 996	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 1.50	4.48 4.81 4.35 4.26 3.67	4.40 4.70 4.24 4.24 3.84	4.44 4.76 4.32 4.30 3.87	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 1.50
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1 1 1 2	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2 2 2 1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/1134 1/1136 1/1123 1/ 607	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.36 4.61 4.65 4.20	3.95 4.25 4.25 4.03	4.13 4.43 4.47 4.03	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	0 1 1 1	3 2 1 2 1	5.00 4.67 4.00 4.67 4.00	1/ 63 26/ 58 45/ 54 34/ 60 31/ 60	4.67	4.51 4.19 4.40 4.51 3.73	4.70 4.55 4.54 4.60 3.95	4.57 4.38 4.41 4.50 3.87	5.00 4.67 4.00 4.67 4.00
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 1 1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00		5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.43 4.14 4.38 4.20 4.36	4.47 4.14 4.43 4.21 4.25		5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Freque	епсу	Dist	ribu	tion										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	е			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Req	uire	d fo	r Maj	ors)	Graduate	. ()	Majo	r	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Gen	eral				- 1)	Under-gr	ad :	3	Non-	major	0
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0		Ele	ctiv	es)	#### - N	leans th	nere a	re not	enoug	h
P 0 I 0 ? 0		Oth	er					2	response	s to be	e sign:	lfican	t	

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2000

Page 472 JUL 10, 2000 Job IRBR3029

			uati	011	Quest 10	nnaı	re						
Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	encies 3	4	In 5 Mea	structor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec
1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1					Mean	Me an	Mean	Mear	Mean
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	13	2 2 0 1 3	1 2 1	0 4 7	0 ;	2 2.6 2 4.0 2 3.4	9 1259/1283 0 ****/1075 4 1113/1220	2.69	4.31 4.20 4.32 4.33	4.17 4.25 4.18	4.29 4.18 4.25 4.25	2.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0	0 0 0 1	1 7 0 2	6 2 0 2	5 0 1	1 15	2 2.8	3 1138/1283 9 1259/1283 0 ****/1075 4 1113/1221 6 1122/1221 8 1120/1157 5 1259/1273 4 404/1281		4.13 4.21 4.11 4.79	4.03 4.08 4.17 4.66	4.04 4.10 4.19 4.65	3.06
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							2.9.	3 1208/1268	2.93	4.11	4.05	4.07	2.93
2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 2	1 0 1 2 2	3 0 5 4 1	5 4 2 3 6 2 6 2 6 1	11 2 2 2	2.94	1155/1221 926/1227 1181/1219 1164/1217	4.56	4.48 4.81 4.35 4.26	4.40 4.70 4.24	4.39 4.71 4.24	3.31 4.56 2.94
1. Did class discussion				1	6 1	3	3.15	828/ 996		3.67	4.24 3.84	4.23	2.88 3.15
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	2 2 2 2	0 0 0 2	2 3 2 2	2 0 1 2	4 3 2 1 3 3 1 3	3 8 5 4	3.21 3.79 3.57	896/1136 954/1123	3.79	4.36 4.61 4.65	3.95 4.25 4.25	4.06 4.33 4.35	3.21
Seminar 2. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme				Ī	• ,	4	3.42	514/ 607		4.20		4.10	3.57
4. Did research projects contribute to what you learned b. Were criteria for grading made clear you learned	15 14 14 15 15	0 0 1 0 0	1 2 0 1	0000	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	1.00 5.00 1.00	****/ 63 ****/ 58 ****/ 54 ****/ 60	****	1.40	4.54	4.81 4.41 4.79	**** ****
Did field experient Field Work	13	U	1	0	0 0	0	1.00	****/ 60		1.51		4.86 3.63	****
To what destructor available for consultation	14	0 0 0	1 2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0 0	0 0	1 00	****/ 41 ****/ 40	**** 4			4.58	****
		0	2	0	0 0	00	1.00		**** 4	.38	4.43	4.09	****
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Credes	ncy D	istr	ibut.	ion				, 00	4	.36	4.25	4.32	***
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 1					ons			Туре			Ма	jors	
6-83 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 14				for	Majors	. ()	Graduate	0		Major		
rad. 0 3.00-3.49 4 D 0		Gene				()	Under-gra	d 16		Non-ma	ior	1
3.50-4.00 6 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		Elect Other				15		#### - Me responses	ans their				A STATE OF COMME

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 1999

Page 495 FEB 14, 2000 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	quer 2	cies	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	001000000	0 0 8 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	1 1 0 0 0 3 0 0	2 2 0 2 1 2 0 2	130333202	8 6 2 7 7 8 4 12 6	4.33 4.17 4.00 4.42 4.42 4.58 3.42 5.00 4.40	761/136 812/114 450/131 371/131 208/124 1204/136 1/136	3 4.17 4.00 2 4.42 7 4.42 8 4.58 2 3.42 5.00	4.34 4.28 4.43 4.39 4.13 4.28 4.18 4.82 4.14	4.22 4.15 4.25 4.16 3.98 4.06 4.14 4.68 4.01	4.22 4.09 4.21 4.14 3.98 4.04 4.64 3.95	4.33 4.17 4.00 4.42 4.42 4.58 3.42 5.00 4.40
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 1 0 1	0 0 0 0 1	1 0 0 3 2	2 0 3 0 1	7 10 6 7 4	4.60 5.00 4.30 4.40 3.67	1/1322 665/1314 604/1313	5.00 4.30 4.40	4.41 4.82 4.38 4.31 3.82	4.35 4.66 4.18 4.20 3.81	4.28 4.62 4.11 4.14 3.83	4.60 5.00 4.30 4.40 3.67
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1 1 1	0 0 0	0000	0 0 0 0	2 0 1 1	3 2 1 3	6 9 9 7	4.36 4.82 4.73 4.55	224/1244	4.82	4.38 4.65 4.57 4.14	3.89 4.16 4.15 3.91	3.88 4.08 4.07 3.86	4.36 4.82 4.73 4.55
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9 9 9	1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 2 0 1	0 0 0 0	1 1 3 0	3.67		3.67	#### 3.67 5.00 ####	4.05 4.13 4.36 4.18	4.10 4.12 4.40 4.04	#### 3.67 5.00 ####
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9 9 9 9	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 1	1 0 0 0	00000	2 2 3 3 2	4.33 4.00 5.00 5.00 4.00	44/ 59 49/ 61 1/ 53 1/ 62 30/ 55	4.00 5.00 5.00	4.53 4.53 4.78 4.67 4.30	4.51 4.46 4.41 4.42 4.04	4.49 3.76 4.25 4.63 3.79	4.33 4.00 5.00 5.00 4.00
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9 10 10 10	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 1 1 0 1	1 0 0 1	2 1 1 1 1	4.00	29/ 40 ####/ 39 ####/ 37 ####/ 35	#### #### ####	4.85 4.52 4.65 4.63 4.60	4.62 4.30 4.53 4.45 4.42	4.72 3.85 4.23 4.33 3.97	4.67 #### #### ####
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11 11 11 11	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0 0	0 1 0 1	0 0 1 0	4.00	####/ 27 ####/ 24 ####/ 16	####	#### #### #### ####	4.28 4.14 4.12 4.17	4.03 3.32 2.75 3.50	#### #### ####

Frequency Distribution

its Earned 27 0 55 0 83 1 150 2 d. 4	Cum. GPA 0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	1 0 0	D 0	Reasons Required for Majors General Electives Other	0	Type Graduate Under-grad #### - Means responses to		Majors Major Non-major	 0 1
			? 1	other .	12	responses to	be signif	not enough	

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 18

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1999

Page 450 JUN 24, 1999 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	00500000	0 1 0 1 1 1 3 0	1 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0	2 0 0 1 1 1 0 0	0 1 1 2 3 4 1 0 2	542432282	4.67 4.00 3.88 3.75	789/1246 1041/1246 240/1057 781/1183 764/1191 845/1127 1207/1237 1/1243 491/1230	4.13 3.63 4.67 4.00 3.88 3.75 2.63 5.00 4.20	4.41 4.27 4.57 4.40 4.10 4.22 4.20 4.80 4.29	4.24 4.15 4.22 4.18 4.02 4.06 4.15 4.66 4.01	4.28 4.17 4.26 4.23 4.07 4.11 4.15 4.68 4.05	4.13 3.63 4.67 4.00 3.88 3.75 2.63 5.00 4.20
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 1 1 3	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 2	2 0 1 3 1	0 1 3 0 0	56340	4.43 4.86 4.29 4.14 2.00	657/1192 451/1195 622/1191 737/1187 942/ 959	4.43 4.86 4.29 4.14 2.00	4.45 4.82 4.42 4.33 3.92	4.35 4.67 4.20 4.20 3.85	4.36 4.67 4.21 4.23 3.90	4.43 4.86 4.29 4.14 2.00
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	5 5 5 5	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0 1	0 0 0 2	2330	4.33 5.00 5.00 3.67	362/1119 1/1118 1/1116 461/ 648	4.33 5.00 5.00 3.67	4.44 4.74 4.70 4.33	3.93 4.24 4.20 3.96	3.95 4.27 4.22 4.02	4.33 5.00 5.00 3.67
Freq	uency	Dis	tribu	ution	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	е			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2		Re	quire	ed fo	r Ma	jors		0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	0
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ge	neral	L			-	0	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	2
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		E1	ectiv	es			1	0	#### - 1					h
P 0 I 0 ? 1		Ot	her				1	6	response	es to b	e sign	ifican	τ	

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1999

Page 470 JUN 24, 1999 Job IRBR3029

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the instr 3. Did the exam 4. Did other eva. 5. Did assigned 6. Did written a: 7. Was the gradi 8. How many time:	uctor make clear t questions reflect luations reflect t readings contribut ssignments contrib ng system clearly s was class cancel	the expected goals he expected goals e to what you learne ute to what you lear explained	ned 0 0 0	0 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 2 0 2 0 0 3 0	1 0 0 0 1 2 1	1 0 1 1 2 2 0 0	0 2 0 1 0 1 1 0 2	2 1 0 1 2 0 0 5 1	3.00 3.00 2.80 3.60 2.80 1.80 5.00	1204/1246 1195/1246 ####/1057 1166/1183 924/11127 1102/1127 1227/1237 1/1243 1119/1230	3.20 3.00 #### 2.80 3.60 2.80 1.80 5.00 3.20	4.41 4.27 4.57 4.40 4.10 4.22 4.20 4.80 4.29	4.24 4.15 4.22 4.18 4.02 4.06 4.15 4.66 4.01	4.32 4.22 4.31 4.25 4.11 4.24 4.22 4.74 4.15	3.20 3.00 #### 2.80 3.60 2.80 1.80 5.00 3.20
2. Did the instru 3. Was lecture ma 4. Did the lecture	aterial presented res contribute to	ted in the subject and explained clearly	0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 3	2 0 2 2 1	0 0 2 0 0	2 0 0 0	1 5 1 2 1	5.00	1107/1192 1/1195 1133/1191 1117/1187 942/ 959	3.40 5.00 3.00 3.00 2.00	4.45 4.82 4.42 4.33 3.92	4.35 4.67 4.20 4.20 3.85	4.37 4.75 4.26 4.21 3.94	3.40 5.00 3.00 3.00 2.00
2. Were all stude 3. Did the instru	ents actively enco	e to what you learned uraged to participate ir and open discussion	0	0 0 0 1	0 0 0	1 0 0 0	1 1 1 1	2 1 2 2	1 3 2 1	3.60 4.40 4.20 4.00	774/1119 549/1118 650/1116 318/ 648	3.60 4.40 4.20 4.00	4.44 4.74 4.70 4.33	3.93 4.24 4.20 3.96	4.11 4.44 4.43 4.09	3.60 4.40 4.20 4.00
		F	requency	Dis	tribu	ution										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grad	les			Rea	sons				Тур	е			Majors	
00-27 1 28-55 0		O A 3		Re	quire	ed fo	r Maj	ors	(0	Graduate	,	2	Majo	r	0
56-83 84-150 0	2.00-2.99	D A 3 D B 2 D C 0 D 0		Ge	neral	l			()	Under-g	ad :	3	Non-	major	1
Grad. 2	3.50-4.00	2 F 0 P 0		E1	ectiv	ves			()	#### - N	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
		I O		Ot	her					5	response	s to be	e sign	1f1can	t	

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101
Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires:

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1999

Page 474 JUN 24, 1999 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	cies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean			Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 1 0 1 1 1 1 1 2	00500000	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	00000000	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 1 1 3 0 0	55 15 4 4 25 4	4.83 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.80 4.80 4.40 5.00 5.00	122/1246 1/1246 ####/1057 1/1183 84/1191 65/1127 478/1237 1/1243 1/1230	4.83 5.00 ### 4.80 4.80 4.40 5.00	4 . 41 4 . 27 4 . 57 4 . 40 4 . 10 4 . 22 4 . 20 4 . 80 4 . 29	4.24 4.15 4.22 4.18 4.02 4.06 4.15 4.66 4.01	4.32 4.22 4.31 4.25 4.11 4.24 4.22 4.74 4.15	4.83 5.00 #### 5.00 4.80 4.80 4.40 5.00
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	5 5 5 5 4	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.80	1/1192 1/1195 1/1191 1/1187 61/ 959	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.80	4.45 4.82 4.42 4.33 3.92	4.35 4.67 4.20 4.20 3.85	4.37 4.75 4.26 4.21 3.94	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 4.80
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1 1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	5 5 5 5	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/1119 1/1118 1/1116 1/ 648	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.44 4.74 4.70 4.33	3.93 4.24 4.20 3.96	4.11 4.44 4.43 4.09	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Frequ	ency	Dis	tribu	tion										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	е			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1		Red	quire	d fo	r Ma	ors		0	Graduate		4	Majo	r	0
28-55		Ger	neral					0	Under-g	ad :	2	Non-	major	0
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 3 F 0		Ele	ectiv	es			1	0	#### - N	leans ti	here a	re not	enoug	h
I O		Ott	ner					5	response	s to be	e sign	ifican	t	

Course-Section: EDUC 792V 0101
Title
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1999

Page 493 JUN 24, 1999 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Ran		Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Me a n	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	00000000	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	0000000	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	5.00	1/1 1/1 1/1 1/1 1/1 1/1	246 246 183 191 127 237 243 230	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.41 4.27 4.40 4.10 4.22 4.20 4.80 4.29	4.24 4.15 4.18 4.02 4.06 4.15 4.66 4.01	4.32 4.22 4.25 4.11 4.24 4.74 4.15	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Lecture 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00	1/1	195 191 187	5.00 5.00 5.00	4.82 4.42 4.33	4.67 4.20 4.20	4.75 4.26 4.21	5.00 5.00 5.00
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		119 116	5.00	4.44	3.93 4.20	4.11	5.00
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	187	5.00	5.00	4.21	4.07	5.00
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	00000	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/ 1/ 1/ 1/ 1/	52 42 43 47 47	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.74 4.81 4.94 4.44 4.62	4.72 4.53 4.46 4.31 4.22	4.84 4.67 4.52 4.33 4.27	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Field Work 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1/	27 29	5.00	4.69 4.62	4.37 4.11	4.42 4.56	5.00
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0000	1 1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/ 1/ 1/ 1/	8 6 6	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	3.59 4.10 4.02 3.53	4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00
Freque	епсу	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	е			Majors	
00-27		Req	uire	ed fo	r Ma	jors		0	Grad	uate		0	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0		Gen	eral	l				0	Unde	r-gr	ad	1	Non-	major	1
Grad: 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0 P 0			ctiv	/es				0	#### resp	- M	leans to b	here a e sign	re not	enoug	h
I 0		Ot h	er					1				3			

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 1998

Page 482 JAN 29, 1999 Job IRBR3029

	Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	t ructor Rar		Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the instr 3. Did the exam 4. Did other eva. 5. Did assigned 6. Did written a: 7. Was the gradi 8. How many time:	General new insights, skills from uctor make clear the exp questions reflect the ex luations reflect the exp readings contribute to w ssignments contribute to ng system clearly explai s was class cancelled grade the overall teach	pected goals pected goals ected goals hat you learned what you learned ned	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2	0 0 11 0 0 0 0	010000000001	0 0 1 0 0 0 3 0 0	0 2 0 0 3 0 1	3 5 0 4 2 3 4 1 2	9 4 0 8 7 9 2 11 7	4.67 4.33 4.75	####/1	1328 1111 1249 1259 186 1323 1327	4.75 3.92 ### 4.67 4.33 4.75 3.08 4.92 4.40	4.43 4.27 4.58 4.44 4.10 4.35 4.17 4.88 4.24	4.23 4.13 4.20 4.13 4.02 4.03 4.12 4.66 3.98	4.23 4.08 4.16 4.12 4.05 3.96 4.05 4.62 3.98	4.75 3.92 #### 4.67 4.33 4.75 3.08 4.92 4.40
2. Did the instru 3. Was lecture ma 4. Did the lecture	Lecture ructor's lectures well p uctor seem interested in aterial presented and ex res contribute to what y al techniques enhance yo	the subject plained clearly ou learned	2 1 2 2 0	0 0 0 0 3	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 1 1 3	3 0 4 4 4	6 11 5 5	4.50 5.00 4.40 4.40 3.56	552/1 1/1 523/1 593/1 643/1	253 237 233	4.50 5.00 4.40 4.40 3.56	4.42 4.86 4.32 4.32 3.87	4.26 4.66 4.14 4.16 3.77	4.23 4.62 4.11 4.15 3.83	4.50 5.00 4.40 4.40 3.56
3. Did the instru	Discussion cussions contribute to wents actively encouraged actor encourage fair and echniques successful	to participate	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0		8 11 10 9	4.58 4.92 4.83 4.75	223/1 129/1 186/1 83/	203	4.58 4.92 4.83 4.75	4.42 4.63 4.60 4.17	3.89 4.17 4.17 3.90	3.89 4.14 4.16 3.95	4.58 4.92 4.83 4.75
3. Was the instru 4. To what degree	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion. 4. Were special techniques successful. Field Work. 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned. 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria. 3. Was the instructor available for consultation. 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations. 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities.					0 0 0 1	0 2 1 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	2 0 1 1	3.00 4.00 3.50	####/ ####/ ####/ ####/	59 47 40 63 42	#### #### #### ####	4.61 4.34 4.58 4.29 4.38	3.94 4.02 4.30 3.99 3.96	4.17 4.16 4.53 4.48 4.28	#### #### #### ####
		Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	tion											
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	е		- 1	Majors	
00-27 0 28-55 0	0.00-0.99 0 1.00-1.99 0	A 10 B 2		Req	uire	d fo	r Maj	ors)	Grad	uate	()	Majo	r	0
56-83 1 84-150 5	2.00-2.99 2 3.00-3.49 2	C 0		Gen	eral				C)	Unde	r-gr	ad 12	?	Non-	major	2
Grad. O	3.50-4.00 4	D 0 F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		Ele Oth	ctiv er	es			12		#### resp	- M onse	eans th s to be	ere al	e not fican	enough t	1

Enrollment:

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 1998

Page 510 JAN 29, 1999 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean				Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1	0 0 5 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 1 3 0 2 0 2	1 4 0 2 2 2 2 0 0	5 1 1 3 1 4 2 6 1	4.83 4.00 5.00 4.33 3.67 4.67 3.00 5.00 3.75	####/1 512/1 935/1 153/1	328 111 249 259 186 323 327	4.83 4.00 #### 4.33 3.67 4.67 3.00 5.00 3.75	4.43 4.27 4.58 4.44 4.10 4.35 4.17 4.88 4.24	4.23 4.13 4.20 4.13 4.02 4.03 4.12 4.66 3.98	4.39 4.17 4.35 4.21 4.11 4.28 4.14 4.81 4.10	4.83 4.00 #### 4.33 3.67 4.67 3.00 5.00 3.75
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2 1 2 2 0	0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 0	2 0 1 0 0	1 0 2 1 2	1 5 1 2 1	3.75 5.00 4.00 4.00 3.50	1051/1 1/1 811/1 818/1 662/1	253 237 233	3.75 5.00 4.00 4.00 3.50	4.42 4.86 4.32 4.32 3.87	4.26 4.66 4.14 4.16 3.77	4.30 4.79 4.17 4.16 3.65	3.75 5.00 4.00 4.00 3.50
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 1	4 5 4 3	4.80 5.00 4.80 4.75	112/1 1/1 208/1 83/	203	4.80 5.00 4.80 4.75	4.42 4.63 4.60 4.17	3.89 4.17 4.17 3.90	4.11 4.41 4.47 3.87	4.80 5.00 4.80 4.75
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5 5 5 5 5 5	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00	####/ ####/ ####/ ####/	65 68 62 74 63	#### #### #### ####	4.35 4.08 4.17 4.29 3.92	4.33 4.30 4.21 4.13 3.80	4.49 4.41 4.22 4.33 3.86	#### #### #### ####
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4 4 4 4	0 0 1 0	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 1	0 1 1 0	1 1 0 0	1 0 0 0	4.50 3.50 3.00 1.50	28/ 36/ ####/ 60/	59 47 40 63	4.50 3.50 #### 1.50	4.61 4.34 4.58 4.29	3.94 4.02 4.30 3.99	4.56 4.29 4.71 4.15	4.50 3.50 #### 1.50
Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ition	1										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		Req	uire	d fo	r Ma	jors		0	Grad	uate	1	2	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0 84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0		Gen	eral					1	Unde	r-gr	ad	4	Non-	major	1
Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 3 F 0		Ele	ctiv	es				0	####	- M	leans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
i o	0							4	respo	onse	s to b	sign	riican		

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101
Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1998

Page 469 JUN 15, 1998 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre		ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	1 2 0 0 1 0 1 3 0	3 2 1 4 2 4 2 1 2	4.75 4.50 5.00 5.00 4.00 5.00 4.25 4.25 5.00	163/1184 323/1183 1/ 996 1/1122 602/1122 1/1052 595/1179 941/1183 1/1176	4.75 4.50 5.00 5.00 4.00 5.00 4.25 4.25 5.00	4.40 4.34 4.26 4.38 4.16 4.22 4.22 4.84 4.26	4.25 4.14 4.22 4.18 4.00 4.07 4.15 4.67 4.00	4.47 4.26 4.27 4.26 4.16 4.28 4.31 4.76 4.20	4.75 4.50 5.00 4.00 5.00 4.25 4.25 5.00
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0	1 0 2 1 1	2 4 2 3 2	4.25 5.00 4.50 4.75 4.67	765/1132 1/1140 396/1136 212/1136 90/ 879	4.25 5.00 4.50 4.75 4.67	4.50 4.89 4.44 4.32 3.90	4.35 4.67 4.19 4.21 3.80	4.43 4.80 4.33 4.39 3.79	4.25 5.00 4.50 4.75 4.67
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	0000	0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0	1 0 0 1	2 4 4 1	4.25 5.00 5.00 4.50	398/1070 1/1070 1/1058 121/ 582	4.25 5.00 5.00 4.50	4.52 4.71 4.67 4.37	3.94 4.22 4.18 3.99	4.23 4.46 4.51 4.20	4.25 5.00 5.00 4.50
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0	1 0 1 0	0 0 0 1 1	3 3 2 3 2	4.50 4.25 4.33 4.75 4.25	26/ 48 33/ 48 32/ 46 19/ 52 26/ 52	4.50 4.25 4.33 4.75 4.25	4.56 4.33 4.46 4.54 3.94	4.34 4.28 4.28 4.31 4.05	4.56 4.14 4.31 4.40 4.00	4.50 4.25 4.33 4.75 4.25
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	tior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Туј	е			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 2 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1		Req	uire	d fo	r Ma	jors		0	Graduate		2	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Gen	eral					0	Under-g	rad :	2	Non-	major	3
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 2 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 P 0		Ele	ctiv	es				0	#### - M	Means th	nere a	re not	enoug	h
į		Oth	er					4	response	55 LO D	s sign.	ritean		

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Instructor: Enrollment: Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1998

Page 464 JUN 15, 1998 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1		ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor			Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 2 2 2 2 0	0 0 5 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	1 1 0 0 2 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 1 0 2 4	6 6 2 7 2 4 3 1 6	4.71 4.71 5.00 5.00 4.00 4.60 4.60 4.20 4.86	195/1 151/1 1/ 1/1 602/1 164/1 261/1	184 183 996 122 122 052 179 183	4.71 4.71 5.00 5.00 4.00 4.60 4.60 4.20 4.86	4.40 4.34 4.26 4.38 4.16 4.22 4.22 4.84 4.26	4 . 25 4 . 14 4 . 22 4 . 18 4 . 00 4 . 07 4 . 15 4 . 67 4 . 00	4 . 47 4 . 26 4 . 27 4 . 26 4 . 16 4 . 28 4 . 31 4 . 76 4 . 20	Me an 4.71 4.71 5.00 5.00 4.00 4.60 4.60 4.20 4.86
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 3	0 0 1 0 0	6 6 5 6 2	5.00 5.00 4.83 5.00 3.80		140 136 136	5.00 5.00 4.83 5.00 3.80	4.50 4.89 4.44 4.32 3.90	4.35 4.67 4.19 4.21 3.80	4.43 4.80 4.33 4.39 3.79	5.00 5.00 4.83 5.00 3.80
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1 1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0	1 0 0 1	5 5 6 5	4.83 4.67 5.00 4.83	96/10 319/10 1/10 63/	070 058	4.83 4.67 5.00 4.83	4.52 4.71 4.67 4.37	3.94 4.22 4.18 3.99	4.23 4.46 4.51 4.20	4.83 4.67 5.00 4.83
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5 5 5 5 5	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 1	0 0 1 0 0	2 2 0 0 1	5.00 5.00 3.50 3.00 4.00	1/ 1/ 124/ ####/ 80/	169 164 165	5.00 5.00 3.50 #### 4.00	4.62 4.08 3.82 3.31 3.94	4.14 4.12 4.00 4.11 3.96	4.16 4.17 4.05 4.00 4.20	5.00 5.00 3.50 #### 4.00
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6 6 6 6	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0	0 0 0 0	1 1 1 0	5.00	####/ ####/	48 46 52 52	#### #### ####	4.56 4.46 4.54 3.94	4.34 4.28 4.31 4.05	4.56 4.31 4.40 4.00	#### #### ####
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4 4 4 4 4	00000	0 0 0 0 0	00000		0 1 1 0 1	3 2 2 1 2	5.00 4.67 4.67 3.67 4.67	12/	35 34 29 31 25	5.00 4.67 4.67 3.67 4.67	4.80 4.29 4.59 4.02 4.23	4.58 4.11 4.19 3.77 3.81	4.40 4.12 4.53 3.55 4.30	5.00 4.67 4.67 3.67 4.67
Freque	ncy	Dist	ribu	tion									0.01	4.00	4.07
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Туре	•			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		Req	uire	d fo	r Maj	ors	()	Gradu	ate		1	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Gen	eral				()	Under	-gra	ad 3	3	Non-	major	0

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1998

Page 436 JUN 15, 1998 Job IRBR3029

									4		•	41.0							
			Questio	ns		NR	NA			ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean		UMBC Me a n		Sect Mean
2345678	Did to Did a Did was to How m	the instruct the exam que ther evalua sssigned rea vritten assi the grading tany times w	or make clea stions reflections reflections contri- gnments contri- system clear as class car	xills from the elect the elect the elect the elect to ribute to ribute elected.	om this course xpected goals expected goals xpected goals what you learned to what you learned ained ching effectiveness	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 2	0 0 15 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0 2 1 0	220363294	13 13 13 13 8 12 13 7	4.69 4.75 5.00 4.81 4.38 4.69 4.69 4.44 4.73	224/1184 123/1183 ####/ 996 87/1122 345/1122 122/1052 189/1179 844/1183 93/1176	4.75 #### 4.81 4.38 4.69	4.40 4.34 4.26 4.38 4.16 4.22 4.22 4.84 4.26	4.25 4.14 4.22 4.18 4.00 4.07 4.15 4.67 4.00	4.27 4.12 4.21 4.22 4.00 4.09 4.07 4.70 4.02	4.69 4.75 #### 4.38 4.69 4.69 4.44 4.73
3 4	. Did t . Was 1 . Did t	he lectures	or seem inte rial present contribute	es well rested ed and to what	prepared in the subject explained clearly you learned your understanding	55555	0 0 0 0 4	0 0 0 0	00000	0 0 1 1 1	1 0 0 2 1	11 12 11 9 5	4.92 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.13	98/1132 1/1140 124/1136 295/1136 322/ 879	4.92 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.13	4.50 4.89 4.44 4.32 3.90	4.35 4.67 4.19 4.21 3.80	4.36 4.66 4.18 4.21 3.88	4.92 5.00 4.83 4.67 4.13
3	. Were . Did t	all students	sions contri s actively e or encourage	ncourag fair a	what you learned ed to participate nd open discussion	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 3	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	3 0 0 2	13 16 16 11	4.81 5.00 5.00 4.85	102/1070 1/1070 1/1058 62/ 582	4.81 5.00 5.00 4.85	4.52 4.71 4.67 4.37	3.94 4.22 4.18 3.99	4.00 4.30 4.24 4.09	4.81 5.00 5.00 4.85
					Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	itior	1									
Cr	redits	Earned	Cum. GF	Α	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Тур	е			Majors	
	00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 14		Req	uire	d fo	r Ma	jor	s	0	Graduate	9 (0	Majo	r	0	
5	28-55	0 2	1.00-1.99	B 2 C 0 D 0		Gen	eral					0	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	1	
	34-150 Grad.	0	3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	3 6 2	F 0		Ele	ctiv	es				0	#### - 1	Means tl	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0 I 0		Oth	er				1	6	response	es to be	e sign	ifican	t		

Course-Section: EDUC 332 0101
Title SCIENCE:SECONDARY SCHO
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1998

Page 438 JUN 15, 1998 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 3 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1 0 0	1 1 0 0 2 0 2 0 2	3 2 1 3 1 4 1 4 2	0 0 0 1 0 0	3.67 4.00 4.25 3.00 4.00 3.75	1015/1184 963/1183 683/996 552/1122 1029/1122 585/1052 918/1179 1085/1183 626/1176	3.75 3.67 4.00 4.25 3.00 4.00 3.75 4.00 4.00	4.40 4.34 4.26 4.38 4.16 4.22 4.22 4.84 4.26	4.25 4.14 4.22 4.18 4.00 4.07 4.15 4.67 4.00	4.27 4.12 4.21 4.22 4.00 4.09 4.07 4.70 4.02	3.75 3.67 4.00 4.25 3.00 4.00 3.75 4.00 4.00
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 1	0 0 1 0 2	4 4 3 3 0	5.00 5.00 4.75 4.50 3.67	1/1132 1/1140 183/1136 434/1136 560/ 879	5.00 5.00 4.75 4.50 3.67	4.50 4.89 4.44 4.32 3.90	4.35 4.67 4.19 4.21 3.80	4.36 4.66 4.18 4.21 3.88	5.00 5.00 4.75 4.50 3.67
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	0 0 0	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	1 0 1 0	3 4 3 2	4.75 5.00 4.75 4.33	133/1070 1/1070 230/1058 195/ 582	4.75 5.00 4.75 4.33	4.52 4.71 4.67 4.37	3.94 4.22 4.18 3.99	4.00 4.30 4.24 4.09	4.75 5.00 4.75 4.33
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	1 0 0 0	2 3 2 3 1	4.67 5.00 4.33 5.00 4.00	20/ 48 1/ 48 32/ 46 1/ 52 29/ 52	4.67 5.00 4.33 5.00 4.00	4.56 4.33 4.46 4.54 3.94	4.34 4.28 4.28 4.31 4.05	3.56 3.67 2.78 4.20 3.90	4.67 5.00 4.33 5.00 4.00
Frequ	епсу	Dist	ribu	tion	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	e			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		Req	uire	d fo	r Maj	ors		0	Graduate		0	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Gen	eral					0	Under-g	rad .	4	Non-	major	0
84-150 4 3.00-3.49 3 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0 P 0 I 0		Ele	ctiv	es				0	#### - N response	Means the	here a	re not ifican	enoug t	h

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 1997

Page 465 JAN 28, 1998 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque 2	ncies 3		5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 0 3	0 0 11 0 0 1 1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 1 1 2 1 0 2	1 6 0 2 3 1 3 0 2	340356305	10 3 2 7 5 6 3 14 4	4.00 4.07 4.00 4.38	1030/1267 ####/1056 687/1191 624/1203	4.64 3.64 #### 4.07 4.00 4.38 3.23 5.00 4.18	4.29 4.09 4.22 4.20 4.08 4.20 4.03 4.86 4.07	4.24 4.11 4.21 4.13 3.99 4.07 4.13 4.68 3.99	4.23 4.04 4.19 4.08 3.95 4.03 4.02 4.69 3.92	4.64 3.64 #### 4.07 4.00 4.38 3.23 5.00 4.18
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3 2 3 3 2	0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 2 0 0	1 0 0 3 3	5 0 4 3 2	5 12 5 5 4	4.36 5.00 4.09 4.18 3.80	708/1197 1/1214 751/1198 707/1195 511/ 940	4.36 5.00 4.09 4.18 3.80	4.26 4.83 4.27 4.21 3.81	4.34 4.66 4.17 4.19 3.80	4.28 4.58 4.08 4.10 3.78	4.36 5.00 4.09 4.18 3.80
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	1 1 1	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 2 5	1 1 1 0	11 11 10 7	4.77 4.77 4.62 4.17	128/1174 246/1172 337/1164 281/ 651	4.77 4.77 4.62 4.17	4.40 4.69 4.60 4.16	3.90 4.18 4.15 3.93	3.87 4.13 4.07 3.88	4.77 4.77 4.62 4.17
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13 13 13 13	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00	####/ 207 ####/ 210 ####/ 207 ####/ 202 ####/ 195	#### #### #### ####	4.55 3.87 4.00 3.45 4.24	3.99 4.04 4.29 4.14 3.94	3.95 4.02 4.28 4.06 3.83	#### #### #### ####
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12 12 12 12 12	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	2 2 2 2 2	5.00 5.00 5.00	####/ 67 ####/ 62 ####/ 47 ####/ 58 ####/ 58	#### #### #### ####	4.45 4.52 4.33 4.36 3.81	4.52 4.35 4.18 4.33 3.72	4.34 4.09 3.81 4.13 3.05	#### #### #### ####
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9 9 8 8 8	0 0 2 1 2	1 1 0 1 0	0 1 0 0	2 1 1 1 2	1 1 0 1 0	1 1 3 2 2	3.20 3.00 4.50 3.60 4.00	29/ 31 26/ 30 13/ 29 16/ 22 15/ 19	3.20 3.00 4.50 3.60 4.00	4.46 3.73 4.39 3.90 4.35	4.31 3.82 4.31 4.11 4.39	4.36 4.13 4.62 4.21 4.37	3.20 3.00 4.50 3.60 4.00
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13 13 13 13	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00	####/ 21 ####/ 15 ####/ 16 ####/ 7 ####/###	#### #### #### ####	#### #### #### ####	4.40 4.43 4.48 4.79 4.60	4.72 4.80 4.30 4.88 5.00	#### #### #### ####

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0	A B	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99	0	CD	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
Grad.	Ö	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1			are not enough	
				I ?	0	Other	12	responses to	be sig	gnificant	

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 1997

Page 494 JAN 28, 1998 Job IRBR3029

		Questions		(.	NR	NA	Fre 1		cies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructo Ra		Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
	1. Did you gain new i 2. Did the instructor 4. Did other evaluati 5. Did assigned readi 6. Did written assign 7. Was the grading sy 8. How many times was 9. How would you grad	make clear tons reflect tongs contributed to the ments contributed to the clearly class cancel	As from this content of the expected go to what you ute to what y explained led	oals oals learned ou learned	0 0 0 0 0 0 3	0000000	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 1 2 0	1 2 0 1 0 2 0	2 1 4 2 3 0 0 3	4 4 3 3 3 3 7 1	4.43 4.29 4.43 4.00 4.14 3.57 5.00 4.25	624/ 533/ 1048/	1267 1191 1203 1117 1258 1268	4.43 4.29 4.43 4.00 4.14 3.57 5.00 4.25	4.29 4.09 4.20 4.08 4.20 4.03 4.86 4.07	4.24 4.11 4.13 3.99 4.07 4.13 4.68 3.99	4.32 4.08 4.14 4.01 4.19 4.15 4.77 4.09	4.43 4.29 4.43 4.00 4.14 3.57 5.00 4.25
	1. Were the instructo 2. Did the instructor 3. Was lecture materi 4. Did the lectures c 5. Did audiovisual te	seem interes al presented ontribute to	ted in the su and explained what you lear	clearly	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 1	4 0 4 5 3	2 7 3 2 2	4.14 5.00 4.43 4.29 4.17	842/ 1/ 489/ 639/ 323/	1214 1198 1195	4.14 5.00 4.43 4.29 4.17	4.26 4.83 4.27 4.21 3.81	4.34 4.66 4.17 4.19 3.80	4.31 4.71 4.19 4.18 3.77	4.14 5.00 4.43 4.29 4.17
	1. Did class discussions: 2. Were all students: 3. Did the instructor 4. Were special technic	actively enco encourage fa	e to what you uraged to par ir and open d	ticipate	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 0 0 0	5 7 7 7	4.71 5.00 5.00 5.00	1/	1174 1172 1164 651	4.71 5.00 5.00 5.00	4.40 4.69 4.60 4.16	3.90 4.18 4.15 3.93	4.07 4.39 4.38 4.01	4.71 5.00 5.00 5.00
	1. Did the lab increa: 2. Were you provided was a were necessary mate 4. Did the lab instructs. 5. Were requirements	with adequate erials availa ctor provide	ing of the ma background i ble for lab a assistance	nformation ctivities	55555	0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0	0 0 0 0 0	2 2 2 1 2	5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00 5.00	####/	210	5.00 5.00 5.00 #### 5.00	4.55 3.87 4.00 3.45 4.24	3.99 4.04 4.29 4.14 3.94	3.99 3.90 4.00 4.06 4.15	5.00 5.00 5.00 #### 5.00
	1. Were assigned topic 2. Was the instructor 3. Did research projec 4. Did presentations of 5. Were criteria for s	available fo cts contribut contribute to	r individual e to what you what you lea	attention learned	6 6 6 6	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0	1 1 1 1 1 1	5.00 5.00 5.00	####/ ####/ ####/ ####/	67 62 47 58 58	#### #### #### ####	4.45 4.52 4.33 4.36 3.81	4.52 4.35 4.18 4.33 3.72	4.52 4.35 4.16 4.36 3.74	#### #### #### ####
	1. Did field experience 2. Did you clearly und 3. Was the instructor 4. To what degree coul 5. Did conferences he	derstand your available fo ld you discus	to what you evaluation c r consultations your evaluations	riteria n tions	6 6 6 6	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 1 0	0 0 0 0 0	1	5.00 3.00 5.00	####/ ####/ ####/ ####/	31 30 29 22 19	#### #### #### ####	4.46 3.73 4.39 3.90 4.35	4.31 3.82 4.31 4.11 4.39	4.30 3.43 4.10 3.75 4.83	#### #### #### ####
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	tion											
(Credits Earned							Rea	sons					Тур	e			Majors	
	28-55 0	1.00-1.99	0 A 0 B	7 0				d fo	r Maj	ors	0		Grad	duate		5	Majo	r	0
	56-83 0 2	2.00-2.99	0 C	0		Gen	eral				0)	Unde	r-gr	ad :	2	Non-	major	0

84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 5 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 7

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 9

Instructor: BLUN Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 1996

Page 465 JAN 22, 1997 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

											44.1	V 11 4	40311	V III II C	4110							
			Que	stio	ns				NR	NA			ncies 3		5		tructor Rank				Level Mean	
2. Did th 3. Did th 4. Did of 5. Did as 6. Did wh 7. Was th 8. How ma	ou gain new he instructhe exam que ther evaluations signed restricten assine grading any times would you go	tor ma estion ations adings ignmen system was cl	ght: ke c rei con ts c ass	clea eflec flec ntrib cont lear:	ills r the ct the t the bute ribut ly ex	e experience experienc	ected good bected good ected good nat you I what you ned	als bals als learned learned	0 0 0 0 0 1	0 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1 1 3 0	0 0 0 1 0 1 1 0 0 0	3 4 2 2 0 3 1 0 2	3 2 0 3 3 0 1 6 3	3.40	470/1173 1083/1190	4.50 4.33 4.00 4.33 3.17 3.40 3.00 5.00 4.60	4.51 4.32 4.43 4.44 4.22 4.33 4.12 4.86 4.19	4.23 4.11 4.23 4.13 4.02 4.05 4.12 4.69 3.98	4.39 4.19 4.21 4.25 4.14 4.29 4.22 4.72 4.15	4.50 4.33 4.00 4.33 3.17 3.40 3.00 5.00 4.60
2. Did th 3. Was le 4. Did th	the instruct ne instruct ecture mate ne lectures udiovisual	tor second	led em i pres	inter sente ute f	es we reste ed an	d in d exp at vo	the subj lained o	learly	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 1 1	3 1 5 3 4	3 5 1 2 1	4.50 4.83 4.17 4.17 4.00	573/1204 513/1208 702/1204 755/1205 376/ 960	4.50 4.83 4.17 4.17 4.00	4.44 4.86 4.36 4.34 3.97	4.33 4.66 4.16 4.20 3.78	4.38 4.77 4.22 4.24 3.81	4.50 4.83 4.17 4.17 4.00
2. Were a 3. Did th	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learn 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participa 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discuss 4. Were special techniques successful					cipate	1 1 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	2 1 1 2	3 4 4 2	4.60 4.80 4.80 4.20	211/1160 234/1164 200/1150 268/ 681	4.60 4.80 4.80 4.20	4.46 4.69 4.66 4.34	3.93 4.23 4.17 3.96	4.09 4.39 4.40 4.10	4.60 4.80 4.80 4.20		
								Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	1									
Credits E	arned	(Cum.	GPA	4		Expecte	d Grades				Rea	asons				Тур	o e			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00			0		A	4		Red	quire	d fo	r Ma	jors)	Graduate	•	2	Majo	r	0
56-83	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 684-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D									Ger	neral	l			()	Under-gr	rad .	4		major	0
Grad.	0.00 0.40									Ele	ectiv	es			()	#### - N	deans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
										Oth	ner				(3	response	es to be	e sign	ifican	t	

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

Instructor: BLUN Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1996

Page 438 JUN 4, 1996 Job IRBR3029

	Question	s		NR	NA	Fr 1		ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Me an		Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the inst 3. Did the exam 4. Did other ev 5. Did assigned 6. Did written 7. Was the grad 8. How many tim	assignments contr ing system clearl es was class canc	lls from the extended the extended the extended the extended to the extended the ex	expected goals expected goals expected goals expected goals what you learned to what you learned	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	0 0 13 1 0 0 0	2 1 0 1 2 1 6 0	2 6 0 3 1 5 0 3	6 2 0 4 3 3 2 0 6	3 3 0 4 4 4 0 7 4	1 2 1 1 4 1 1 7	2.93 5.00 3.08 3.50 2.93 1.93 4.50	1205/1218 1182/1218 ####/1023 1110/1144 984/1156 1051/1078 1197/1207 884/1217 1094/1213	2.93 2.93 ### 3.08 3.50 2.93 1.93 4.50 3.21	4.45 4.35 4.59 4.40 4.26 4.37 4.19 4.78 4.30	4.27 4.18 4.24 4.18 4.09 4.09 4.17 4.71 4.71	4 23 4 11 4 20 4 16 4 04 4 07 4 14 4 72 3 96	2.93 2.93 #### 3.08 3.50 2.93 1.93 4.50 3.21
3. Was lecture at Did the lect	ures contribute t	s well ested d and o what	in the subject explained clearly	1 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 4	1 0 3 3 1	2 1 2 4 2	5 1 5 2 3	4 2 2 3 1	1 9 1 1 2	4.46 2.69 2.62	1122/1163 934/1174 1121/1158 1121/1158 782/ 908	3.15 4.46 2.69 2.62 3.11	4.49 4.86 4.39 4.40 3.96	4.38 4.68 4.20 4.21 3.87	4.35 4.66 4.19 4.17 3.87	3.15 4.46 2.69 2.62 3.11
3. Did the inst	dents actively en	ute to courag fair a	what you learned ed to participate nd open discussion	8 8 8 8	0 0 0	1 1 1 0	0 0 1 3	5 1 1 0	0 3 1 2	0 1 2 1	2.67 3.50 3.33 3.17	1052/1127 947/1129 982/1121 532/ 598	2.67 3.50 3.33 3.17	4.46 4.71 4.61 4.31	3.93 4.24 4.20 4.09	3.96 4.25 4.20 4.15	2.67 3.50 3.33 3.17
			Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	ition										
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	е			Majors	
00-27 0 28-55 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quire	d fo	r Maj	ors	()	Graduate	. ()	Majo	 r	0
56-83 5 84-150 6	8-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 6 6-83 5 2.00-2.99 4 C 0 4-150 6 3.00-3.49 6 D 0									C)	Under-gr	ad 14	1	Non-	major	0
Grad. O							es			C)	#### - M	leans th	nere a	re not	enoug	h
			I 0		Oth	ier				14	ı	response	S LO DE	sign.	iiican	τ	

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

Course-Section: EDUC 332 0101
Title SCIENCE:SECONDARY SCHO
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1996

Page 441 JUN 4, 1996 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

0	NP NA		Frequencies NA 1 2 3		Instruc			ructor	Course					
Questions	NK	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. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0	1 1 0 1 2 0 0	1 2 3 0 1 0 2	1 0 0 2 0 1 1 2	4.00 3.67 4.00 4.33 3.33 2.67 4.33 4.67	885/1218 1018/1218 733/1144 418/1156 976/1078 1175/1207 972/1217 126/1213	4.00 3.67 4.00 4.33 3.33 2.67 4.33 4.67	4.35 4.40 4.26 4.37	4.27 4.18 4.18 4.09 4.09 4.17 4.71 4.71	4.16 4.04 4.07 4.14	4.33
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 1 1	2 3 2 2	4.67 5.00 4.67 4.67	409/1163 1/1174 267/1158 301/1158	4.67 5.00 4.67 4.67	4.86	4.38 4.68 4.20 4.21	4.35 4.66 4.19 4.17	5.00 4.67
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	2 2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 1	1 1 1 0	5.00 5.00 5.00 4.00	1/1127 1/1129 1/1121 326/ 598	5.00	4.46 4.71 4.61 4.31	3.93 4.24 4.20 4.09	3 96 4.25 4.20 4.15	5.00 5.00 5.00 4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	E	xpecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0		A	1 2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
56-83 84-150	0	2.00-2.99	0		200	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	0
Grad.	ō	3.50-4.00	Ô		F	0	Electives	0			re not enough	
					Ī	0	Other	2	responses to	be sign	ilficant	

Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101 Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1996 Page 469 JUN 4, 1996 Job IRBR3029

Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this of the instructor make clear the expected gas. Did the exam questions reflect the expected questions reflect the expected questions reflect the expected gas in the example of the expected gas in the expected gas in the property of the expected gas in the example of the expected gas in the example of the expected gas in the example of the example of the expected gas in the example of the expected gas in the example of the example of the example of the expected gas in the example of the example of the example of the expected gas in the example of the example of the example of the expected gas in the example of the expected gas in the example of the	oals goals oals learned ou learned	0 0 0 1 0 0 0	0 0 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0	0 2 1 1 1 2 1 0	1 1 1 1 2 2 1 2	6 4 1 4 5 3 3 5 4	4.86 4.29 4.00 4.50 4.57 4.14 4.00 4.83 4.67	106/1218 578/1218 706/1023 308/1144 221/1156 535/1078 812/1207 672/1217 126/1213	4.86 4.29 4.00 4.50 4.57 4.14 4.00 4.83 4.67	4.45 4.35 4.59 4.40 4.26 4.37 4.19 4.78 4.30	4.27 4.18 4.24 4.18 4.09 4.09 4.17 4.71 4.71	4.44 4.24 4.33 4.24 4.25 4.19 4.80 4.17	4.86 4.29 4.00 4.50 4.57 4.14 4.00 4.83 4.67
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the su 3. Was lecture material presented and explained 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you lear 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your unde	bject clearly ned	2 2 2 2 2 2	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	1 0 2 0 1	4 5 3 5 1	4.80 5.00 4.60 5.00 3.50	243/1163 1/1174 326/1158 1/1158 645/ 908	4.80 5.00 4.60 5.00 3.50	4.49 4.86 4.39 4.40 3.96	4.38 4.68 4.20 4.21 3.87	4.52 4.78 4.31 4.35 3.86	4.80 5.00 4.60 5.00 3.50
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you 2. Were all students actively encouraged to par 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open d 4. Were special techniques successful	ticipate	2 2 2 2	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 2 0 0	3 0 1 2	1 3 4 3	4.00 4.20 4.80 4.60	550/1127 699/1129 222/1121 143/ 598	4.00 4.20 4.80 4.60	4.46 4.71 4.61 4.31	3.93 4.24 4.20 4.09	4.18 4.48 4.44 4.07	4.00 4.20 4.80 4.60
	Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ıtion	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expec	ted Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	е			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B	7		Rec	uire	d fo	r Ma	jors	(0	Graduate		4	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C	0		Gen	eral				()	Under-g	rad :	3	Non-	major	1
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 0 D Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 7	0 0 0		Ele	ctiv	es			()	#### - 1					h
P I ?	0		Oth	ier					7	response	es to be	e sign	ifican	t	

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101 Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN Instructor: BLUN Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 1996

Page 475 JUN 4. 1996 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Me an	tructor Ran		Course			Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 0 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0	0 2 2 0 2 2 0	4 3 3 3 1 2 2 3	1 0 0 1 0 0 2	3.60 4.25 3.00	1041/1 992/1 489/1 1034/1 1061/1 884/1	218 144 156 078 207 217	4.20 3.60 3.60 4.25 3.00 3.50 4.50 4.25	4.45 4.35 4.40 4.26 4.37 4.19 4.78 4.30	4.27 4.18 4.18 4.09 4.09 4.17 4.71 4.71	4.44 4.24 4.24 4.25 4.19 4.80 4.17	4.20 3.60 3.60 4.25 3.00 3.50 4.50 4.25
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0 0 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	3 0 0 0	2 0 3 3 1	0 5 1 1 0	3.40 5.00 4.25 4.25 3.00	1092/1 1/1 636/1 651/1 796/	174 158 158	3.40 5.00 4.25 4.25 3.00	4.49 4.86 4.39 4.40 3.96	4.38 4.68 4.20 4.21 3.87	4.52 4.78 4.31 4.35 3.86	3.40 5.00 4.25 4.25 3.00
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 0 1	3 0 0 3	1 4 5 1	4.00 4.60 5.00 4.00	550/1: 444/1: 1/1: 326/	129 121	4.00 4.60 5.00 4.00	4.46 4.71 4.61 4.31	3.93 4.24 4.20 4.09	4.18 4.48 4.44 4.07	4.00 4.60 5.00 4.00
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3 4 3 3	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 0 2 0	1 1 0 0 1	4.50 4.50 1.00 4.00 3.50	33/	64 58 51 65	4.50 4.50 #### 4.00 3.50	4.53 4.73 4.50 4.24 4.39	4.75 4.55 4.55 4.41 3.99	4.72 4.57 4.62 4.45 3.93	4.50 4.50 #### 4.00 3.50
Self Paced 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4 4	0	0	0	0	1 1	0 0		####/ ####/	21 28	####	4.75 4.21	4.58	4.80	####
Freque	ency	Dist	ribu	tion											
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	е			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0		Req	uire	d fo	r Maj	ors		0	Gradi	uate		1	Majo	r	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Gen	eral					0	Under	r-gr	ad .	L	Non-	major	4
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 2 F 0	Electives						0 #### -				- Means there are not enoug			h	
P 0	O tho i						!	5	respo	onse	s to be	sign	ifican	t	

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 16

Instructor: BLUI Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 1995

Page 443 JAN 24, 1996 Job IRBR3029

Questions		NR	NA	Fre 1	equen 2	cies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean			Level Mean	
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from thi 2. Did the instructor make clear the expecte 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expect 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expect 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what 6. Did written assignments contribute to wha 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching	d goals ed goals d goals you learned t you learned	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 4	0 0 5 0 0 0 1	0 1 0 1 0 0 4 0	1 6 1 2 0 2 3 0 1	632566302	2 2 2 2 2 4 1 0 5	4 1 3 3 5 1 1 13 0	2.69 3.88 3.31 3.92 3.31 2.33 5.00	1124/1278 1254/1277 848/1092 1124/1204 743/1220 1040/1144 1257/1272 1/1277 1156/1262	2.69 3.88 3.31 3.92 3.31 2.33 5.00	4.34 4.10 4.39 4.26 4.03 4.21 4.13 4.89 4.05	4.26 4.14 4.23 4.15 4.02 4.07 4.16 4.68 3.98	4.30 4.14 4.19 4.20 4.01 4.12 4.16 4.70 3.95	3.69 2.69 3.88 3.31 3.92 3.31 2.33 5.00 3.22
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepa 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the 3. Was lecture material presented and explain 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you le 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your uniterested.	subject ned clearly earned	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 2 4 0	3 1 5 4 4	5 0 2 3 5	4 12 4 2 3	4.85 3.62 3.23	1016/1238 512/1243 1053/1236 1135/1227 552/ 956	3.92 4.85 3.62 3.23 3.69	4.25		4.36 4.66 4.18 4.21 3.76	3.92 4.85 3.62 3.23 3.69
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what y 2. Were all students actively encouraged to y 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open 4. Were special techniques successful	participate	3333	0 0 0 1	1 0 1 0	1 0 1 1	4 4 4 3	3 2 1 3	1 4 3 2	4.00	974/1199 771/1204 1034/1192 451/ 663	3.20 4.00 3.40 3.67	4.28 4.54 4.50 4.02	3.88 4.20 4.15 3.93	3.87 4.17 4.13 3.95	3.20 4.00 3.40 3.67
	Frequ	епсу	Dist	ribu	tion										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Exp	pected Grades				Rea	sons				Тур	o e			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0	A 11		Req	uire	d fo	r Maj	ors	()	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 56-83 0 2.00-2.99 2 84-150 7 3.00-3.49 6	B 2 C 0 D 0		Gen	eral				()	Under-g	rad 1	3		major	2
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3	F 0		Ele	ctiv	es			()	#### - 1	deans t	here a	re not	enoug	h
	P O		Oth	er				12	2	response	es to be	e sign	ifican	t	

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN Title Instructor: Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 1995

Page 472 JAN 24, 1996 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst	ructor Ran		Course Mean			Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights skills from this course. 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals. 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals. 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals. 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned. 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained. 8. How many times was class cancelled. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness.	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 4	0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0 4 0 2 0 2 1	2 1 3 2 2 2 0 0 2	5 2 4 3 5 2 1 7 4	4.57 4.14 4.71 3.57	217/1 1044/1 293/1 646/1 130/1 949/1 1264/1 1/1 88/1	277 092 204 220 144 272 277	4.71 3.71 4.57 4.14 4.71 3.57 2.00 5.00 4.67	4.34 4.10 4.39 4.26 4.03 4.21 4.13 4.89 4.05	4.26 4.14 4.23 4.15 4.02 4.07 4.16 4.68 3.98	4.35 4.11 4.27 4.15 4.17 4.16 4.14 4.76 4.10	4.71 3.71 4.57 4.14 4.71 3.57 2.00 5.00 4.67
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0 0	1 0 2 0 2	2 0 2 5 2	4 7 2 2 0	4.43 5.00 3.71 4.29 3.50	672/1 1/1 1008/1 653/1 634/	243 236 227	4.43 5.00 3.71 4.29 3.50	4.29 4.80 4.25 4.16 3.79	4.37 4.69 4.19 4.22 3.78	4.32 4.74 4.19 4.18 3.67	4.43 5.00 3.71 4.29 3.50
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0 0	2 0 1 3	4 7 6 3	4.43 5.00 4.86 4.50	314/1 1/1 150/1 132/	204	4.43 5.00 4.86 4.50	4.28 4.54 4.50 4.02	3.88 4.20 4.15 3.93	4.05 4.37 4.41 3.87	4.43 5.00 4.86 4.50
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6 6 6	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0 1	0 1 1 0	5.00	####/ ####/ ####/	224	#### #### #### ####	4.50 4.32 4.47 4.38	4.17 4.16 4.36 4.29	4.65 4.60 4.61 4.55	#### #### ####
Frequ	епсу	Dist	ribu	ution	1										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	sons					Тур	е			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Grad	luate	!	7	Majo	r :	0
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0		Ger	ne ral	l				0	Unde	r-gı	ad	0	Non-	major	1
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0 Grad. 7 3.50-4.00 5 F 0 P 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0			leans t				h
r o		Ott	ner					7	resp	OHSE	s to b	e sign	TITCAL	11	

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 1996

Page 436 JAN 22, 1997 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5							Inst	ructor			UMBC Level		Sect
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
2. Did 3. Did 4. Did 5. Did 6. Did 7. Was 8. How	General you gain new insights skills from this course the instructor make clear the expected goals the exam questions reflect the expected goals other evaluations reflect the expected goals assigned readings contribute to what you learned written assignments contribute to what you learned the grading system clearly explained many times was class cancelled would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	000000000000000000000000000000000000000	0 0 14 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0	0 3 0 2 1 1 5 0 0	420133506	4 4 0 7 5 7 2 0 4	8 7 2 6 7 3 16 4	4.25 3.94 5.00 4.06 4.13 3.67 3.06 5.00 3.86	700/1251 842/1251 ####/1048 698/1173 584/1190 851/1104 114/1243 1/1251 790/1235	4.25 3.94 #### 4.06 4.13 3.67 3.06 5.00 3.86	4.32 4.43 4.44 4.22 4.33 4.12 4.86	4.23 4.13 4.02 4.05	4.26 4.08 4.21 4.15 4.01 4.07 4.08 4.71 3.94	#### 4.06 4.13 3.67
2. Did 3. Was 4. Did	Lecture e the instructor's lectures well prepared the instructor seem interested in the subject lecture material presented and explained clearly the lectures contribute to what you learned audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1 1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 3	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 2 0	1	8	6	1 33	728/1204 1/1208 885/1204	1 33	4.44 4.86 4.36 4.34 3.97	4.33 4.66 4.16 4.20 3.78	4.28 4.62 4.12 4.16 3.75	4.33 5.00 3.87 3.93 3.83
2. Wer 3. Did	Discussion class discussions contribute to what you learned e all students actively encouraged to participate the instructor encourage fair and open discussion e special techniques successful	3 3 3	0 0 0	1 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	4 2 1 0	4 2 5 8	4 9 7 4	3.77 4.54 4.46 4.15	725/1160 452/1164 465/1150 288/ 681	3.77 4.54 4.46 4.15	4.46 4.69 4.66 4.34	3.93 4.23 4.17 3.96	3.91 4.18 4.13 3.98	3.77 4.54 4.46 4.15

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13 B 2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0	
56-83 84-150	1	2.00-2.99	6	C 0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F O	Electives	0			are not enough		
				I 0	Other	15	responses to	be sig	niricant		