

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	10	4.36	702/1398	4.36	4.44	4.27	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1196/1397	3.64	4.33	4.21	4.23
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1175	****	4.37	4.26	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	6	4.15	769/1338	4.15	4.47	4.20	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	0	3	1	5	3.42	1134/1338	3.42	4.11	4.03	4.02
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	3	7	3.86	883/1289	3.86	4.38	4.07	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	1	1	7	3.43	1237/1384	3.43	4.36	4.18	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	805/1394	4.79	4.80	4.68	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	2	3	1	6	3.92	895/1375	3.92	4.29	4.06	4.08
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	984/1335	4.14	4.46	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1340	5.00	4.89	4.70	4.70
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	820/1338	4.21	4.47	4.27	4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	878/1334	4.14	4.42	4.26	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	1	2	8	4.15	424/1136	4.15	3.93	3.90	3.92
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	468/1216	4.36	4.52	4.02	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	305/1223	4.79	4.71	4.30	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	485/1223	4.57	4.69	4.26	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	173/ 762	4.50	4.27	3.99	4.03
Laboratory													
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	82/ 182	4.36	3.43	4.25	4.16
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	33/ 185	4.79	3.64	4.28	4.26
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	21/ 181	4.93	4.46	4.35	4.33
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	37/ 176	4.79	4.14	4.35	4.32
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	6	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	28/ 167	4.71	3.36	4.16	3.92
Field Work													
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	36/ 49	4.31	4.65	4.52	4.57
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	31/ 48	4.15	4.38	4.37	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	3	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	32/ 47	4.44	4.68	4.60	4.37
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	3	2	1	2	0	4	3.33	37/ 45	3.33	4.21	4.23	4.10
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	20/ 40	4.83	4.16	4.27	4.22
Self Paced													
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 25	****	****	4.55	4.11
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 19	****	****	4.68	4.11

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives 0	
				Other 13	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	5		Rank							
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	5.00	1/1397		5.00	4.33	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		5.00	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		5.00	4.80	4.68	4.70	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 Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2002

Page 495
 JUN 11, 2002
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank	Mean	Mean					
General																
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1001/1398	4.00	4.44	4.27	4.45	4.00		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1394/1397	2.00	4.33	4.21	4.28	2.00		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1296/1338	3.00	4.47	4.20	4.30	3.00		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1314/1338	2.50	4.11	4.03	4.16	2.50		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	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	0	2.50	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	1	4.50	994/1394	4.50	4.80	4.68	4.73	4.50		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	761/1375	4.00	4.29	4.06	4.12	4.00		
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1331/1335	2.00	4.46	4.39	4.49	2.00		
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	0	2.50	1320/1338	2.50	4.47	4.27	4.38	2.50		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1311/1334	2.50	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																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1166/1216	2.50	4.52	4.02	4.18	2.50		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	852/1223	4.00	4.71	4.30	4.52	4.00		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1141/1223	3.00	4.69	4.26	4.50	3.00		
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	2.50	3.64	4.28	4.47	2.50		
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	136/ 181	4.00	4.46	4.35	4.68	4.00		
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	163/ 176	3.50	4.14	4.35	4.54	3.50		
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	166/ 167	2.00	3.36	4.16	4.44	2.00		
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/ 45	4.00	4.38	4.37	4.49	4.00		
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47	4.00	4.68	4.60	4.78	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		

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank	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	1	4.00	964/1397	4.00	4.33	4.21	4.28	4.00		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1338	4.50	4.47	4.20	4.30	4.50		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	294/1338	4.50	4.11	4.03	4.16	4.50		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	280/1289	4.50	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	4.52	4.02	4.18	4.50		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1223	5.00	4.71	4.30	4.52	5.00		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	537/1223	4.50	4.69	4.26	4.50	4.50		
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	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	1	4.50	49/ 67	4.50	4.76	4.74	4.81	4.50		
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.72	4.70	4.80	5.00		
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	39/ 67	4.50	4.69	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	5.00	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	4.28	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		

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2001

Page 550
 JAN 23, 2002
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank							
General																
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	713/1489	4.33	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.3		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	969/1489	4.00	4.34	4.16	4.18	4.00		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1231/1272	3.00	4.50	4.24	4.28	3.00		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1175/1401	3.67	4.34	4.17	4.21	3.67		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	748/1412	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.13	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		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.77	5.00		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1332/1404	3.00	4.46	4.20	4.29	3.00		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1314/1402	3.00	4.40	4.21	4.26	3.00		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1193/1214	2.00	3.97	3.84	3.87	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		
2. 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		
3. 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		
4. 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 Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	0	7	7	3.83	1175/1489	3.83	4.37	4.23	4.23	3.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	3	6	3.56	1278/1489	3.56	4.34	4.16	4.14	3.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1272	****	4.50	4.24	4.21	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	3	6	5	3.59	1213/1401	3.59	4.34	4.17	4.16	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	1	7	4	3.47	1135/1412	3.47	4.00	4.01	3.98	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	4	5	3.53	1124/1348	3.53	4.33	4.05	4.03	3.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	2	3	7	3.39	1322/1473	3.39	4.34	4.16	4.07	3.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	7	3	6	3.67	1119/1472	3.67	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1408	****	4.48	4.36	4.31	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1412	****	4.85	4.67	4.65	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1404	****	4.46	4.20	4.16	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1402	****	4.40	4.21	4.18	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1214	****	3.97	3.84	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	784/1344	3.88	4.42	3.94	3.96	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	793/1337	4.13	4.58	4.18	4.17	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	1082/1335	3.63	4.59	4.18	4.17	3.63
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	405/ 837	4.00	4.24	3.97	3.96	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	4.43	3.83	3.97	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	3.97	3.87	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.53	4.33	4.52	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 40	****	4.46	4.20	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	Graduate	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	8			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	Under-grad	18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	Non-major	3
				P	0			
				I	0			
				?	0			
						Other		17

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2001

Page 434
JUN 16, 2001
Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	341/1315	4.64	4.48	4.25	4.32	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	483/1315	4.45	4.35	4.21	4.23	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1127	****	4.57	4.28	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	487/1257	4.40	4.47	4.19	4.25	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	635/1266	4.09	4.21	4.05	4.04	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	545/1177	4.18	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	1	2	5	3.90	999/1306	3.90	4.38	4.20	4.18	3.90	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1315	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.67	5.00	
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															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.57	4.42	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1261	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.48	4.27	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1253	5.00	4.53	4.28	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/1073	4.75	4.05	3.91	3.98	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	214/1152	4.71	4.55	4.04	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	485/1153	4.57	4.72	4.29	4.35	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1150	5.00	4.68	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	91/ 703	4.86	4.32	4.04	4.13	4.86	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	33/ 45	4.00	4.37	4.36	4.32	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	35/ 45	3.50	3.94	4.02	4.06	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	23/ 38	4.67	4.55	4.53	4.60	4.67	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	36/ 40	3.67	4.37	4.36	4.37	3.67	
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	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2001

Page 436
 JUN 16, 2001
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	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	0	4.00	912/1315	4.00	4.35	4.21	4.23	4.00	
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 Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2001

Page 455
 JUN 16, 2001
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank	Mean						Mean
General																
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	4.29	4.00		
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1315	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.81	5.00		
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	5.00	4.53	4.28	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	331/1152	4.50	4.55	4.04	4.29	4.50		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1153	5.00	4.72	4.29	4.55	5.00		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1150	5.00	4.68	4.29	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	0	4.00	33/ 45	4.00	4.37	4.36	3.95	4.00		
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 45	4.00	3.94	4.02	3.67	4.00		
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	4.55	4.53	4.42	5.00		
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	40/ 40	2.00	4.37	4.36	4.30	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		

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2001

Page 456
 JUN 16, 2001
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Evaluation Questionnaire															Job	IRBR3029
Questions			Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank								
General																
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	734/1315	4.25	4.48	4.25	4.40	4.25		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	705/1315	4.25	4.35	4.21	4.30	4.25		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1127	5.00	4.57	4.28	4.38	5.00		
4. Did other evaluations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	155/1257	4.75	4.47	4.19	4.28	4.75		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1037/1266	3.50	4.21	4.05	4.20	3.50		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	882/1177	3.75	4.33	4.08	4.24	3.75		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	910/1306	4.00	4.38	4.20	4.29	4.00		
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	895/1315	4.50	4.82	4.66	4.81	4.50		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	532/1306	4.25	4.22	4.07	4.24	4.25		
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	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	1	2	4.67	844/1261	4.67	4.88	4.70	4.79	4.67		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1084/1256	3.67	4.48	4.27	4.38	3.67		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	679/1253	4.33	4.53	4.28	4.39	4.33		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	724/1073	3.67	4.05	3.91	3.98	3.67		
Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1152	5.00	4.55	4.04	4.29	5.00		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1153	5.00	4.72	4.29	4.55	5.00		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	677/1150	4.25	4.68	4.29	4.55	4.25		
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	298/703	4.25	4.32	4.04	4.00	4.25		
Laboratory																
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	166/166	1.00	4.13	4.10	4.13	1.00		
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/169	5.00	4.55	4.18	4.06	5.00		
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/161	5.00	4.77	4.33	4.54	5.00		
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	161/162	1.00	4.00	4.23	4.05	1.00		
Seminar																
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	57/69	4.00	4.48	4.57	4.54	4.00		
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/66	5.00	4.57	4.68	4.66	5.00		
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	49/63	4.00	4.53	4.55	4.54	4.00		
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/70	5.00	4.43	4.47	4.44	5.00		
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	68/68	1.00	3.93	4.04	3.90	1.00		
Field Work																
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	42/45	2.00	4.37	4.36	3.95	2.00		
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	37/45	3.00	3.94	4.02	3.67	3.00		
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/40	5.00	4.37	4.36	4.30	5.00		
Self Paced																
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/29	5.00	5.00	4.75	4.43	5.00		
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/26	4.00	4.75	4.58	4.53	4.00		
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/28	5.00	5.00	4.66	4.68	5.00		
Credits Earned																
Cum. GPA																
Expected Grades																
Frequency Distribution																

Credits Earned

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA
00-27	1
28-55	0
56-83	0
84-150	0
Grad.	1

Expected Grades

Expected Grades	
A	3
B	1
C	0
D	0
F	0
P	0

Frequency Distribution

Reasons

Reasons	
Required for Majors	0
General	0
Electives	0

Type

Type	
Graduate	1
Under-grad	3

Majors

Majors	
Major	0
Non-major	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be

I 0
? 0

Other

3

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

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	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	3.33	****/1168	****	4.39	4.24	4.25	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	4	7	4	3.53	1174/1326	3.53	4.38	4.17	4.21	3.53	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	6	3	7	3.63	1024/1320	3.63	4.08	4.01	4.04	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	6	6	3	3.30	1115/1260	3.30	4.25	4.03	4.04	3.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	2	9	1	3	2.75	1335/1376	2.75	4.19	4.15	4.11	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	807/1392	4.74	4.81	4.67	4.66	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	735/1379	4.00	4.15	4.02	4.01	4.00	
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	17	4.65	867/1321	4.65	4.86	4.68	4.66	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	3	8	7	3.95	928/1313	3.95	4.32	4.20	4.16	3.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	5	7	3.65	1120/1316	3.65	4.33	4.24	4.20	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	2	2	4	7	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	12	4.42	591/1246	4.42	4.65	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		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank							
General																
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	0	7	7	3.83	1175/1489	3.83	4.37	4.23	4.23	3.83		
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	3	6	3.56	1278/1489	3.56	4.34	4.16	4.14	3.56		
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1272	****	4.50	4.24	4.21	****		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	3	6	5	3.59	1213/1401	3.59	4.34	4.17	4.16	3.59		
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	1	7	4	3.47	1135/1412	3.47	4.00	4.01	3.98	3.47		
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	4	5	3.53	1124/1348	3.53	4.33	4.05	4.03	3.53		
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	2	3	7	3.39	1322/1473	3.39	4.34	4.16	4.07	3.39		
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1487	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.62	5.00		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	7	3	6	3.67	1119/1472	3.67	4.14	4.02	4.00	3.67		
Lecture																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1408	****	4.48	4.36	4.31	****		
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1412	****	4.85	4.67	4.65	****		
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1404	****	4.46	4.20	4.16	****		
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1402	****	4.40	4.21	4.18	****		
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1214	****	3.97	3.84	3.82	****		
Discussion																
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	784/1344	3.88	4.42	3.94	3.96	3.88		
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	2	0	1	5	4.13	793/1337	4.13	4.58	4.18	4.17	4.13		
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	2	0	1	1	4	3.63	1082/1335	3.63	4.59	4.18	4.17	3.63		
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	405/ 837	4.00	4.24	3.97	3.96	4.00		
Field Work																
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 53	****	4.43	3.83	3.97	****		
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.50	3.97	3.87	****		
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	4.53	4.33	4.52	****		
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 40	****	4.46	4.20	4.32	****		

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Section: EDUC 623 0101
 Title: INSTRU STRTG TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2001

Page 550
 JAN 23, 2002
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions

General

- Did you gain new insights, skills from this course
- Did the instructor make clear the expected goals
- Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals
- Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals
- Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned
- Did written assignments contribute to what you learned
- Was the grading system clearly explained
- How many times was class cancelled
- How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness

NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	713/1489	4.33	4.37	4.23	4.34	4.33
0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	969/1489	4.00	4.34	4.16	4.18	4.00
0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1231/1272	3.00	4.50	4.24	4.28	3.00
0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.67	1175/1401	3.67	4.34	4.17	4.21	3.67
0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	748/1412	4.00	4.00	4.01	4.13	4.00
0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.33	434/1348	4.33	4.33	4.05	4.26	4.33
0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	953/1473	4.00	4.34	4.16	4.27	4.00
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.33	1/1487	5.00	4.79	4.64	4.76	5.00
0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	477/1472	4.33	4.14	4.02	4.16	4.33

Lecture

- Were the instructor's lectures well prepared
- Did the instructor seem interested in the subject
- Was lecture material presented and explained clearly
- Did the lectures contribute to what you learned
- Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding

2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1364/1408	3.00	4.48	4.36	4.46	3.00
2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.85	4.67	4.77	5.00
2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1332/1404	3.00	4.46	4.20	4.29	3.00
2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1314/1402	3.00	4.40	4.21	4.26	3.00
2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1193/1214	2.00	3.97	3.84	3.87	2.00

Discussion

- Did class discussions contribute to what you learned
- Were all students actively encouraged to participate
- Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion
- Were special techniques successful

2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1184/1344	3.00	4.42	3.94	4.06	3.00
2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1231/1337	3.00	4.58	4.18	4.35	3.00
2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	841/1335	4.00	4.59	4.18	4.36	4.00
2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	405/837	4.00	4.24	3.97	4.05	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Cum. GPA

Expected Grades

Reasons

Type

Majors

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRTG TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2000

Page 497
 JUL 10, 2000
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	914/1283	4.00	4.31	4.26	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	846/1283	4.00	4.20	4.17	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1075	5.00	4.32	4.25	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	796/1220	4.00	4.33	4.18	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	474/1221	4.25	4.13	4.03	4.19	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	475/1157	4.25	4.21	4.08	4.23	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1034/1273	3.75	4.11	4.17	4.16	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	730/1281	4.75	4.79	4.66	4.79	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	929/1268	3.75	4.11	4.05	4.13	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	982/1221	4.00	4.48	4.40	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	971/1227	4.50	4.81	4.70	4.76	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1219	4.25	4.35	4.24	4.32	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	841/1217	4.00	4.26	4.24	4.30	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	980/ 996	2.00	3.67	3.84	3.87	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	262/1134	4.50	4.36	3.95	4.13	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	481/1136	4.50	4.61	4.25	4.43	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	470/1123	4.50	4.65	4.25	4.47	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	209/ 607	4.33	4.20	4.03	4.03	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2000

Page 474
 JUL 10, 2000
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1121/1283	3.67	4.31	4.26	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1275/1283	2.33	4.20	4.17	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	796/1220	4.00	4.33	4.18	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1125/1221	3.00	4.13	4.03	4.04
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	915/1157	3.67	4.21	4.08	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1271/1273	1.00	4.11	4.17	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1281	5.00	4.79	4.66	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	980/1268	3.67	4.11	4.05	4.07
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	982/1221	4.00	4.48	4.40	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1227	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1044/1219	3.67	4.35	4.24	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1020/1217	3.67	4.26	4.24	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	944/ 996	2.50	3.67	3.84	3.91
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	262/1134	4.50	4.36	3.95	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1136	5.00	4.61	4.25	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1123	5.00	4.65	4.25	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	315/ 607	4.00	4.20	4.03	4.10
Seminar													
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.81
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	58/ 58	3.00	4.19	4.55	4.41
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 54	5.00	4.40	4.54	4.79
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 60	5.00	4.51	4.60	4.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	60/ 60	1.00	3.73	3.95	3.63
Field Work													
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 41	3.00	4.43	4.47	4.58
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	40/ 40	1.00	4.14	4.14	3.96
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	36/ 36	2.00	4.38	4.43	4.09
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	36/ 36	1.00	4.20	4.21	3.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
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	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: EDUC 629 0101
 Title INST STRAT:TCHNG SEC S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2000

Page 502
 JUL 10, 2000
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	450/1283	4.50	4.31	4.26	4.38	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1114/1283	3.50	4.20	4.17	4.25	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1075	****	4.32	4.25	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	796/1220	4.00	4.33	4.18	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	812/1221	3.86	4.13	4.03	4.19	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	445/1157	4.29	4.21	4.08	4.23	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	1	3	0	1	2.83	1215/1273	2.83	4.11	4.17	4.16	2.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	762/1281	4.71	4.79	4.66	4.79	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	261/1268	4.50	4.11	4.05	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	982/1221	4.00	4.48	4.40	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1227	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1044/1219	3.67	4.35	4.24	4.32	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	792/1217	4.13	4.26	4.24	4.30	4.13
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	5	1	0	3.17	824/ 996	3.17	3.67	3.84	3.87	3.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	142/1134	4.75	4.36	3.95	4.13	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1136	5.00	4.61	4.25	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1123	5.00	4.65	4.25	4.47	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	400/ 607	3.88	4.20	4.03	4.03	3.88
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	53/ 63	4.40	4.51	4.70	4.57	4.40
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	56/ 58	3.60	4.19	4.55	4.38	3.60
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 54	5.00	4.40	4.54	4.41	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 60	4.80	4.51	4.60	4.50	4.80
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	51/ 60	3.20	3.73	3.95	3.87	3.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.43	4.47	4.43	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.14	4.14	4.15	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.50	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.20	4.21	4.16	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.36	4.25	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 792P 0201
 Title
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2000

Page 525
 JUL 10, 2000
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	663/1283	4.33	4.31	4.26	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	576/1283	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1075	5.00	4.32	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	204/1220	4.67	4.33	4.18	4.24	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	655/1221	4.00	4.13	4.03	4.19	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1039/1157	3.33	4.21	4.08	4.23	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1111/1273	3.50	4.11	4.17	4.16	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1281	5.00	4.79	4.66	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	261/1268	4.50	4.11	4.05	4.13	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	4.48	4.40	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1227	5.00	4.81	4.70	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1219	5.00	4.35	4.24	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1217	5.00	4.26	4.24	4.30	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	994/ 996	1.50	3.67	3.84	3.87	1.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1134	5.00	4.36	3.95	4.13	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1136	5.00	4.61	4.25	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1123	5.00	4.65	4.25	4.47	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 607	5.00	4.20	4.03	4.03	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.51	4.70	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	26/ 58	4.67	4.19	4.55	4.38	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	45/ 54	4.00	4.40	4.54	4.41	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	34/ 60	4.67	4.51	4.60	4.50	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	31/ 60	4.00	3.73	3.95	3.87	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.43	4.47	4.43	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.14	4.14	4.15	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.50	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	4.20	4.21	4.16	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	4.36	4.25	4.07	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2000

Page 472
 JUL 10, 2000
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	1138/1283	3.63	4.31	4.26	4.29	3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	6	5	1	2	2.69	1259/1283	2.69	4.20	4.17	4.18	2.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1075	****	4.32	4.25	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	7	2	3.44	1113/1220	3.44	4.33	4.18	4.25	3.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	7	2	3	3.06	1122/1221	3.06	4.13	4.03	4.04	3.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	5	2	2	2.88	1120/1157	2.88	4.21	4.08	4.10	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	7	2	5	0	2	2.25	1259/1273	2.25	4.11	4.17	4.19	2.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	404/1281	4.94	4.79	4.66	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	2	2	7	3	1	2.93	1208/1268	2.93	4.11	4.05	4.07	2.93
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	5	4	3	3.31	1155/1221	3.31	4.48	4.40	4.39	3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	926/1227	4.56	4.81	4.70	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	5	6	2	2	2.94	1181/1219	2.94	4.35	4.24	4.24	2.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	6	2	2	2.88	1164/1217	2.88	4.26	4.24	4.23	2.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	6	1	3	3.15	828/ 996	3.15	3.67	3.84	3.91	3.15
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	4	3	3	3.21	935/1134	3.21	4.36	3.95	4.06	3.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	3	0	2	1	8	3.79	896/1136	3.79	4.61	4.25	4.33	3.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	2	1	3	3	5	3.57	954/1123	3.57	4.65	4.25	4.35	3.57
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	2	1	3	4	3.42	514/ 607	3.42	4.20	4.03	4.10	3.42
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	4.51	4.70	4.81	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.19	4.55	4.41	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 54	****	4.40	4.54	4.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 60	****	4.51	4.60	4.86	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 60	****	3.73	3.95	3.63	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	4.43	4.47	4.58	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 40	****	4.14	4.14	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.43	4.09	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	4.20	4.21	3.90	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 33	****	4.36	4.25	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D	0	Other	15				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0						
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	0						

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	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	660/1369	4.33	4.34	4.22	4.22	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	761/1368	4.17	4.28	4.15	4.09	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	812/1149	4.00	4.43	4.25	4.21	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	450/1312	4.42	4.39	4.16	4.14	4.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	371/1317	4.42	4.13	3.98	3.98	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	208/1248	4.58	4.28	4.06	4.04	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	2	2	4	3.42	1204/1362	3.42	4.18	4.14	4.04	3.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1369	5.00	4.82	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	375/1355	4.40	4.14	4.01	3.95	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	562/1318	4.60	4.41	4.35	4.28	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1322	5.00	4.82	4.66	4.62	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	665/1314	4.30	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.30
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	0	7	4.40	604/1317	4.40	4.31	4.20	4.14	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	661/1050	3.67	3.82	3.81	3.83	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	367/1245	4.36	4.38	3.89	3.88	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	224/1244	4.82	4.65	4.16	4.08	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	283/1241	4.73	4.57	4.15	4.07	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	139/ 718	4.55	4.14	3.91	3.86	4.55
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	####/ 200	####	####	4.05	4.10	####
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	166/ 206	3.67	3.67	4.13	4.12	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.40	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	####/ 195	####	####	4.18	4.04	####
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	44/ 59	4.33	4.53	4.51	4.49	4.33
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	49/ 61	4.00	4.53	4.46	3.76	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 53	5.00	4.78	4.41	4.25	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	4.67	4.42	4.63	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	30/ 55	4.00	4.30	4.04	3.79	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	29/ 40	4.67	4.85	4.62	4.72	4.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	####/ 39	####	4.52	4.30	3.85	####
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	####/ 37	####	4.65	4.53	4.23	####
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	####/ 35	####	4.63	4.45	4.33	####
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	####/ 34	####	4.60	4.42	3.97	####
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	####/ 27	####	####	4.28	4.03	####
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	####/ 24	####	####	4.14	3.32	####
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 16	####	####	4.12	2.75	####
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	####/ 10	####	####	4.17	3.50	####

Frequency Distribution

its Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	1
83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0	Other	12				
d.	4	3.50-4.00	4	F	0						
				I	0						
				?	1						

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	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	789/1246	4.13	4.41	4.24	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	1	4	3.63	1041/1246	3.63	4.27	4.15	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	240/1057	4.67	4.57	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	781/1183	4.00	4.40	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	764/1191	3.88	4.10	4.02	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	845/1127	3.75	4.22	4.06	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	0	1	2	2.63	1207/1237	2.63	4.20	4.15	2.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.80	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	491/1230	4.20	4.29	4.01	4.20
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	657/1192	4.43	4.45	4.35	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	451/1195	4.86	4.82	4.67	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	622/1191	4.29	4.42	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	737/1187	4.14	4.33	4.20	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	942/ 959	2.00	3.92	3.85	2.00
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	362/1119	4.33	4.44	3.93	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1118	5.00	4.74	4.24	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1116	5.00	4.70	4.20	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	461/ 648	3.67	4.33	3.96	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1204/1246	3.20	4.41	4.24	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1195/1246	3.00	4.27	4.15	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	####/1057	####	4.57	4.22	####
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	1	1	1	2.80	1166/1183	2.80	4.40	4.18	2.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	924/1191	3.60	4.10	4.02	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1102/1127	2.80	4.22	4.06	2.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	1.80	1227/1237	1.80	4.20	4.15	1.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.80	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	3.20	1119/1230	3.20	4.29	4.01	3.20
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1107/1192	3.40	4.45	4.35	3.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1195	5.00	4.82	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	3.00	1133/1191	3.00	4.42	4.20	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	3.00	1117/1187	3.00	4.33	4.20	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	2.00	942/ 959	2.00	3.92	3.85	2.00
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	774/1119	3.60	4.44	3.93	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	549/1118	4.40	4.74	4.24	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	650/1116	4.20	4.70	4.20	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	318/ 648	4.00	4.33	3.96	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 1999

Page 474
 JUN 24, 1999
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	122/1246	4.83	4.41	4.24	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1246	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.22
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/1057	####	4.57	4.22	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1183	5.00	4.40	4.18	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	84/1191	4.80	4.10	4.02	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	65/1127	4.80	4.22	4.06	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	478/1237	4.40	4.20	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.74
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1230	5.00	4.29	4.01	4.15
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1192	5.00	4.45	4.35	4.37
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1195	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1191	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1187	5.00	4.33	4.20	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	61/ 959	4.80	3.92	3.85	3.94
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1119	5.00	4.44	3.93	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1118	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1116	5.00	4.70	4.20	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 648	5.00	4.33	3.96	4.09

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1246	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1246	5.00	4.27	4.15	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1183	5.00	4.40	4.18	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1191	5.00	4.10	4.02	4.11	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1127	5.00	4.22	4.06	4.24	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1237	5.00	4.20	4.15	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.80	4.66	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1230	5.00	4.29	4.01	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1195	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1191	5.00	4.42	4.20	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1187	5.00	4.33	4.20	4.21	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1119	5.00	4.44	3.93	4.11	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1116	5.00	4.70	4.20	4.43	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.74	4.72	4.84	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.81	4.53	4.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 43	5.00	4.94	4.46	4.52	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.33	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.62	4.22	4.27	5.00
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	4.69	4.37	4.42	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 29	5.00	4.62	4.11	4.56	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 8	5.00	5.00	3.59	4.00	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	4.10	4.00	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	4.02	4.00	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 6	5.00	5.00	3.53	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	211/1328	4.75	4.43	4.23	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	948/1328	3.92	4.27	4.13	3.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	####/1111	####	4.58	4.20	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	188/1249	4.67	4.44	4.13	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	442/1259	4.33	4.10	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	103/1186	4.75	4.35	4.03	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	1	4	2	3.08	1212/1323	3.08	4.17	4.12	3.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	498/1327	4.92	4.88	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	2	7	4.40	345/1284	4.40	4.24	3.98	4.40
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	552/1260	4.50	4.42	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1253	5.00	4.86	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	523/1237	4.40	4.32	4.14	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	593/1233	4.40	4.32	4.16	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	643/1004	3.56	3.87	3.77	3.56
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	223/1207	4.58	4.42	3.89	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	129/1203	4.92	4.63	4.17	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	186/1205	4.83	4.60	4.17	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	83/722	4.75	4.17	3.90	4.75
Field Work													
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	####/59	####	4.61	3.94	4.17
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	####/47	####	4.34	4.02	4.16
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	####/40	####	4.58	4.30	4.53
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	####/63	####	4.29	3.99	4.48
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/42	####	4.38	3.96	4.28

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	Graduate	0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	General	0
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	Under-grad	12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	Electives	0
				Other	12
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 1998

Page 510
 JAN 29, 1999
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies						Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	147/1328	4.83	4.43	4.23	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	867/1328	4.00	4.27	4.13	4.17	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/1111	####	4.58	4.20	4.35	####
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	512/1249	4.33	4.44	4.13	4.21	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	935/1259	3.67	4.10	4.02	4.11	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	153/1186	4.67	4.35	4.03	4.28	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1221/1323	3.00	4.17	4.12	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1327	5.00	4.88	4.66	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	898/1284	3.75	4.24	3.98	4.10	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1051/1260	3.75	4.42	4.26	4.30	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1253	5.00	4.86	4.66	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	811/1237	4.00	4.32	4.14	4.17	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	818/1233	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.16	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	662/1004	3.50	3.87	3.77	3.65	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	112/1207	4.80	4.42	3.89	4.11	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1203	5.00	4.63	4.17	4.41	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	208/1205	4.80	4.60	4.17	4.47	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	83/ 722	4.75	4.17	3.90	3.87	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	####/ 65	####	4.35	4.33	4.49	####
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 68	####	4.08	4.30	4.41	####
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 62	####	4.17	4.21	4.22	####
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 74	####	4.29	4.13	4.33	####
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 63	####	3.92	3.80	3.86	####
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 59	4.50	4.61	3.94	4.56	4.50
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	36/ 47	3.50	4.34	4.02	4.29	3.50
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	####/ 40	####	4.58	4.30	4.71	####
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	60/ 63	1.50	4.29	3.99	4.15	1.50

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	163/1184	4.75	4.40	4.25	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	323/1183	4.50	4.34	4.14	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 996	5.00	4.26	4.22	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.38	4.18	4.26
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	602/1122	4.00	4.16	4.00	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1052	5.00	4.22	4.07	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	595/1179	4.25	4.22	4.15	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	941/1183	4.25	4.84	4.67	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1176	5.00	4.26	4.00	4.20
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	765/1132	4.25	4.50	4.35	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1140	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	396/1136	4.50	4.44	4.19	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	212/1136	4.75	4.32	4.21	4.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	90/ 879	4.67	3.90	3.80	3.79
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	398/1070	4.25	4.52	3.94	4.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1070	5.00	4.71	4.22	4.46
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1058	5.00	4.67	4.18	4.51
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	121/ 582	4.50	4.37	3.99	4.20
Seminar													
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	26/ 48	4.50	4.56	4.34	4.56
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	33/ 48	4.25	4.33	4.28	4.14
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	32/ 46	4.33	4.46	4.28	4.31
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	19/ 52	4.75	4.54	4.31	4.40
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	26/ 52	4.25	3.94	4.05	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
 Title INSTRU STRTG TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 1998

Page 464
 JUN 15, 1998
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	195/1184	4.71	4.40	4.25	4.47	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	151/1183	4.71	4.34	4.14	4.26	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 996	5.00	4.26	4.22	4.27	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.38	4.18	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	602/1122	4.00	4.16	4.00	4.16	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	164/1052	4.60	4.22	4.07	4.28	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	261/1179	4.60	4.22	4.15	4.31	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	970/1183	4.20	4.84	4.67	4.76	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	52/1176	4.86	4.26	4.00	4.20	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1132	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1140	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	124/1136	4.83	4.44	4.19	4.33	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1136	5.00	4.32	4.21	4.39	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	495/ 879	3.80	3.90	3.80	3.79	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	96/1070	4.83	4.52	3.94	4.23	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	319/1070	4.67	4.71	4.22	4.46	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1058	5.00	4.67	4.18	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	63/ 582	4.83	4.37	3.99	4.20	4.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 168	5.00	4.62	4.14	4.16	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 169	5.00	4.08	4.12	4.17	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	124/ 164	3.50	3.82	4.00	4.05	3.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	####/ 165	####	3.31	4.11	4.00	####
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	80/ 162	4.00	3.94	3.96	4.20	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 48	####	4.56	4.34	4.56	####
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 46	####	4.46	4.28	4.31	####
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 52	####	4.54	4.31	4.40	####
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	####/ 52	####	3.94	4.05	4.00	####
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.80	4.58	4.40	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	7/ 34	4.67	4.29	4.11	4.12	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	12/ 29	4.67	4.59	4.19	4.53	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	18/ 31	3.67	4.02	3.77	3.55	3.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	7/ 25	4.67	4.23	3.81	4.30	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	224/1184	4.69	4.40	4.25	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	123/1183	4.75	4.34	4.14	4.12
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 996	####	4.26	4.22	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	87/1122	4.81	4.38	4.18	4.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	345/1122	4.38	4.16	4.00	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	122/1052	4.69	4.22	4.07	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	189/1179	4.69	4.22	4.15	4.07
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	844/1183	4.44	4.84	4.67	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	93/1176	4.73	4.26	4.00	4.02
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	98/1132	4.92	4.50	4.35	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1140	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.66
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	124/1136	4.83	4.44	4.19	4.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	295/1136	4.67	4.32	4.21	4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	4	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	322/ 879	4.13	3.90	3.80	3.88
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	102/1070	4.81	4.52	3.94	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1070	5.00	4.71	4.22	4.30
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1058	5.00	4.67	4.18	4.24
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	62/ 582	4.85	4.37	3.99	4.09

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 1998

Page 438
 JUN 15, 1998
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1015/1184	3.75	4.40	4.25	4.27	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	963/1183	3.67	4.34	4.14	4.12	3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	683/ 996	4.00	4.26	4.22	4.21	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	552/1122	4.25	4.38	4.18	4.22	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1029/1122	3.00	4.16	4.00	4.00	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	585/1052	4.00	4.22	4.07	4.09	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	918/1179	3.75	4.22	4.15	4.07	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1085/1183	4.00	4.84	4.67	4.70	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	626/1176	4.00	4.26	4.00	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1132	5.00	4.50	4.35	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1140	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	183/1136	4.75	4.44	4.19	4.18	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	434/1136	4.50	4.32	4.21	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	560/ 879	3.67	3.90	3.80	3.88	3.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	133/1070	4.75	4.52	3.94	4.00	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1070	5.00	4.71	4.22	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	230/1058	4.75	4.67	4.18	4.24	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	195/ 582	4.33	4.37	3.99	4.09	4.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 48	4.67	4.56	4.34	3.56	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.33	4.28	3.67	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	32/ 46	4.33	4.46	4.28	2.78	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.54	4.31	4.20	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	3.94	4.05	3.90	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	279/1267	4.64	4.29	4.24	4.23	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	4	3	3.64	1030/1267	3.64	4.09	4.11	4.04	3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	####/1056	####	4.22	4.21	4.19	####
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	687/1191	4.07	4.20	4.13	4.08	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	624/1203	4.00	4.08	3.99	3.95	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	334/1117	4.38	4.20	4.07	4.03	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	2	3	3	3	3.23	1151/1258	3.23	4.03	4.13	4.02	3.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1268	5.00	4.86	4.68	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	511/1256	4.18	4.07	3.99	3.92	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	708/1197	4.36	4.26	4.34	4.28	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1214	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.58	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	0	4	5	4.09	751/1198	4.09	4.27	4.17	4.08	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	707/1195	4.18	4.21	4.19	4.10	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	511/ 940	3.80	3.81	3.80	3.78	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	128/1174	4.77	4.40	3.90	3.87	4.77
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	246/1172	4.77	4.69	4.18	4.13	4.77
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	337/1164	4.62	4.60	4.15	4.07	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	5	0	7	4.17	281/ 651	4.17	4.16	3.93	3.88	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 207	####	4.55	3.99	3.95	####
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 210	####	3.87	4.04	4.02	####
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 207	####	4.00	4.29	4.28	####
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 202	####	3.45	4.14	4.06	####
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 195	####	4.24	3.94	3.83	####
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	####/ 67	####	4.45	4.52	4.34	####
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	####/ 62	####	4.52	4.35	4.09	####
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	####/ 47	####	4.33	4.18	3.81	####
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	####/ 58	####	4.36	4.33	4.13	####
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	####/ 58	####	3.81	3.72	3.05	####
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	29/ 31	3.20	4.46	4.31	4.36	3.20
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	26/ 30	3.00	3.73	3.82	4.13	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	13/ 29	4.50	4.39	4.31	4.62	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	8	1	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	16/ 22	3.60	3.90	4.11	4.21	3.60
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	8	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	15/ 19	4.00	4.35	4.39	4.37	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 21	####	####	4.40	4.72	####
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 15	####	####	4.43	4.80	####
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 16	####	####	4.48	4.30	####
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 7	####	####	4.79	4.88	####
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/####	####	####	4.60	5.00	####

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRIGY TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 1997

Page 494
 JAN 28, 1998
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	516/1267	4.43	4.29	4.24	4.32	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	561/1267	4.29	4.09	4.11	4.08	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	383/1191	4.43	4.20	4.13	4.14	4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	624/1203	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.01	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	533/1117	4.14	4.20	4.07	4.19	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1048/1258	3.57	4.03	4.13	4.15	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1268	5.00	4.86	4.68	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	443/1256	4.25	4.07	3.99	4.09	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	842/1197	4.14	4.26	4.34	4.31	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1214	5.00	4.83	4.66	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	489/1198	4.43	4.27	4.17	4.19	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	639/1195	4.29	4.21	4.19	4.18	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	323/940	4.17	3.81	3.80	3.77	4.17
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	150/1174	4.71	4.40	3.90	4.07	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.69	4.18	4.39	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1164	5.00	4.60	4.15	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/651	5.00	4.16	3.93	4.01	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.55	3.99	3.99	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/210	5.00	3.87	4.04	3.90	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/207	5.00	4.00	4.29	4.00	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/202	####	3.45	4.14	4.06	####
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/195	5.00	4.24	3.94	4.15	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/67	####	4.45	4.52	4.52	####
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/62	####	4.52	4.35	4.35	####
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/47	####	4.33	4.18	4.16	####
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/58	####	4.36	4.33	4.36	####
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/58	####	3.81	3.72	3.74	####
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/31	####	4.46	4.31	4.30	####
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/30	####	3.73	3.82	3.43	####
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	####/29	####	4.39	4.31	4.10	####
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/22	####	3.90	4.11	3.75	####
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/19	####	4.35	4.39	4.83	####

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
 Title INSTRUC STRTG Y TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 1996

Page 465
 JAN 22, 1997
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	417/1251	4.50	4.51	4.23	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	534/1251	4.33	4.32	4.11	4.19
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	739/1048	4.00	4.43	4.23	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	470/1173	4.33	4.44	4.13	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	1083/1190	3.17	4.22	4.02	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	974/1104	3.40	4.33	4.05	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	1149/1243	3.00	4.12	4.12	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1251	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.72
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	153/1235	4.60	4.19	3.98	4.15
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	573/1204	4.50	4.44	4.33	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	513/1208	4.83	4.86	4.66	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	702/1204	4.17	4.36	4.16	4.22
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	755/1205	4.17	4.34	4.20	4.24
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	376/960	4.00	3.97	3.78	3.81
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	211/1160	4.60	4.46	3.93	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	234/1164	4.80	4.69	4.23	4.39
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	200/1150	4.80	4.66	4.17	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	268/681	4.20	4.34	3.96	4.10

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 1996

Page 438
 JUN 4, 1996
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	6	3	1	2.93	1205/1218	2.93	4.45	4.27	4.23	2.93
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	2	3	2	2.93	1182/1218	2.93	4.35	4.18	4.11	2.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/1023	####	4.59	4.24	4.20	####
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	4	4	1	3.08	1110/1144	3.08	4.40	4.18	4.16	3.08
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	3	4	4	3.50	984/1156	3.50	4.26	4.09	4.04	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	5	3	4	1	2.93	1051/1078	2.93	4.37	4.09	4.07	2.93
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	5	2	0	1	1.93	1197/1207	1.93	4.19	4.17	4.14	1.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	884/1217	4.50	4.78	4.71	4.72	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	3	6	4	1	3.21	1094/1213	3.21	4.30	4.00	3.96	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	5	4	1	3.15	1122/1163	3.15	4.49	4.38	4.35	3.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	9	4.46	934/1174	4.46	4.86	4.68	4.66	4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	2	5	2	1	2.69	1121/1158	2.69	4.39	4.20	4.19	2.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	2	3	1	2.62	1121/1158	2.62	4.40	4.21	4.17	2.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	782/ 908	3.11	3.96	3.87	3.87	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	5	0	0	2.67	1052/1127	2.67	4.46	3.93	3.96	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	947/1129	3.50	4.71	4.24	4.25	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	982/1121	3.33	4.61	4.20	4.20	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	532/ 598	3.17	4.31	4.09	4.15	3.17

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 1996

Page 441
 JUN 4 1996
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	885/1218	4.00	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1018/1218	3.67	4.35	4.18	4.11	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	733/1144	4.00	4.40	4.18	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	418/1156	4.33	4.26	4.09	4.04	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	976/1078	3.33	4.37	4.09	4.07	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1175/1207	2.67	4.19	4.17	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	972/1217	4.33	4.78	4.71	4.72	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	126/1213	4.67	4.30	4.00	3.96	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	409/1163	4.67	4.49	4.38	4.35	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1174	5.00	4.86	4.68	4.66	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	267/1158	4.67	4.39	4.20	4.19	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	301/1158	4.67	4.40	4.21	4.17	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1127	5.00	4.46	3.93	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1129	5.00	4.71	4.24	4.25	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.61	4.20	4.20	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	326/ 598	4.00	4.31	4.09	4.15	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 623 0101
 Title: INSTRUC STRTGY TEACH S
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 1996

Page 469
 JUN 4, 1996
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	106/1218	4.86	4.45	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	578/1218	4.29	4.35	4.18	4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	706/1023	4.00	4.59	4.24	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	308/1144	4.50	4.40	4.18	4.24
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	221/1156	4.57	4.26	4.09	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	535/1078	4.14	4.37	4.09	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	812/1207	4.00	4.19	4.17	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	672/1217	4.83	4.78	4.71	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	126/1213	4.67	4.30	4.00	4.17
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1163	4.80	4.49	4.38	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1174	5.00	4.86	4.68	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	326/1158	4.60	4.39	4.20	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1158	5.00	4.40	4.21	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	645/ 908	3.50	3.96	3.87	3.86
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	550/1127	4.00	4.46	3.93	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	699/1129	4.20	4.71	4.24	4.48
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1121	4.80	4.61	4.20	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	143/ 598	4.60	4.31	4.09	4.07

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 1996

Page 475
 JUN 4, 1996
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	742/1218	4.20	4.45	4.27	4.44	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1041/1218	3.60	4.35	4.18	4.24	3.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	992/1144	3.60	4.40	4.18	4.24	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	489/1156	4.25	4.26	4.09	4.24	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	3.00	1034/1078	3.00	4.37	4.09	4.25	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1061/1207	3.50	4.19	4.17	4.19	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	884/1217	4.50	4.78	4.71	4.80	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	431/1213	4.25	4.30	4.00	4.17	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1092/1163	3.40	4.49	4.38	4.52	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1174	5.00	4.86	4.68	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	636/1158	4.25	4.39	4.20	4.31	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	651/1158	4.25	4.40	4.21	4.35	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	796/ 908	3.00	3.96	3.87	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	550/1127	4.00	4.46	3.93	4.18	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	444/1129	4.60	4.71	4.24	4.48	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.61	4.20	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	326/ 598	4.00	4.31	4.09	4.07	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	53/ 64	4.50	4.53	4.75	4.72	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	33/ 58	4.50	4.73	4.55	4.57	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	####/ 51	####	4.50	4.55	4.62	####	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	47/ 61	4.00	4.24	4.41	4.45	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	48/ 65	3.50	4.39	3.99	3.93	3.50	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	####/ 21	####	4.75	4.58	4.80	####	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	####/ 28	####	4.21	4.46	4.37	####	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: EDUC 330 0101
 Title TCHNG SCIENCE:ELEM SCH
 Instructor: BLUNCK, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 1995

Page 443
 JAN 24, 1996
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	6	2	4	3.69	1124/1278	3.69	4.34	4.26	4.30	3.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	3	2	1	2.69	1254/1277	2.69	4.10	4.14	4.14	2.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	848/1092	3.88	4.39	4.23	4.19	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	2	3	3.31	1124/1204	3.31	4.26	4.15	4.20	3.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	2	5	3.92	743/1220	3.92	4.03	4.02	4.01	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	6	4	1	3.31	1040/1144	3.31	4.21	4.07	4.12	3.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	3	3	1	1	2.33	1257/1272	2.33	4.13	4.16	4.16	2.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	2	5	0	3.22	1156/1262	3.22	4.05	3.98	3.95	3.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1016/1238	3.92	4.29	4.37	4.36	3.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	512/1243	4.85	4.80	4.69	4.66	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	5	2	4	3.62	1053/1236	3.62	4.25	4.19	4.18	3.62	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	4	3	2	3.23	1135/1227	3.23	4.16	4.22	4.21	3.23	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	552/ 956	3.69	3.79	3.78	3.76	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	974/1199	3.20	4.28	3.88	3.87	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	771/1204	4.00	4.54	4.20	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	4	1	3	3.40	1034/1192	3.40	4.50	4.15	4.13	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	451/ 663	3.67	4.02	3.93	3.95	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 1995

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
			1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course.	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	217/1278	4.71	4.34	4.26	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1044/1277	3.71	4.10	4.14	4.11	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	293/1092	4.57	4.39	4.23	4.27	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	646/1204	4.14	4.26	4.15	4.15	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	130/1220	4.71	4.03	4.02	4.17	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	949/1144	3.57	4.21	4.07	4.16	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	4	0	1	0	1	2.00	1264/1272	2.00	4.13	4.16	4.14	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.89	4.68	4.76	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	88/1262	4.67	4.05	3.98	4.10	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1238	4.43	4.29	4.37	4.32	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.80	4.69	4.74	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	3.71	1008/1236	3.71	4.25	4.19	4.19	3.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	653/1227	4.29	4.16	4.22	4.18	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	634/ 956	3.50	3.79	3.78	3.67	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	314/1199	4.43	4.28	3.88	4.05	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1204	5.00	4.54	4.20	4.37	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	150/1192	4.86	4.50	4.15	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	132/ 663	4.50	4.02	3.93	3.87	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	####/ 223	####	4.50	4.17	4.65	####	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 224	####	4.32	4.16	4.60	####	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	####/ 218	####	4.47	4.36	4.61	####	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	####/ 219	####	4.38	4.29	4.55	####	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General													
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	700/1251	4.25	4.51	4.23	4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	4	7	3.94	842/1251	3.94	4.32	4.11	4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	####/1048	####	4.43	4.23	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	6	4.06	698/1173	4.06	4.44	4.13	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	584/1190	4.13	4.22	4.02	4.01
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	7	3	3.67	851/1104	3.67	4.33	4.05	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	5	5	2	3	3.06	1144/1243	3.06	4.12	4.12	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1251	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	790/1235	3.86	4.19	3.98	3.94
Lecture													
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	728/1204	4.33	4.44	4.33	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1208	5.00	4.86	4.66	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	885/1204	3.87	4.36	4.16	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	4	6	3.93	869/1205	3.93	4.34	4.20	4.16
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	3	4	4	3.83	504/ 960	3.83	3.97	3.78	3.75
Discussion													
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	725/1160	3.77	4.46	3.93	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	452/1164	4.54	4.69	4.23	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	465/1150	4.46	4.66	4.17	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	8	4	4.15	288/ 681	4.15	4.34	3.96	3.98

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	6	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						