```
Course-Section: GWST 100  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page  852
Title        INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES          Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  KELBER-KAYE, JO                Spring 2007                                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     38
Questionnaires: 34                          Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                    Frequencies       Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions                        NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5 Mean    Rank   Mean   Mean Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   1   0   5  11  17 4.26  889/1522  4.26  4.51 4.30 4.14  4.26
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   3   4  16  11 4.03 1069/1522  4.03  4.48 4.26 4.18  4.03
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  29   0   0   1   2   2 4.20 ****/1285  ****  4.85 4.30 4.22  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   3  13  17 4.35  682/1476  4.35  4.55 4.22 4.09  4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0   1   3   1   6  22 4.36  466/1412  4.36  4.64 4.06 4.01  4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   1   6   9  18 4.29  565/1381  4.29  4.45 4.08 3.93  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   3   6   9  16 4.12  924/1500  4.12  4.32 4.18 4.16  4.12
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   1   0   4  24   5 3.94 1425/1517  3.94  4.05 4.65 4.62  3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0  0   0   6   9  12 4.22  685/1497  4.22  4.33 4.11 4.02  4.22

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0   0   0   6  12  14 4.25 1047/1440  4.25  4.55 4.45 4.40  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0   0   0   0   3  29 4.91  494/1448  4.91  4.96 4.71 4.63  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3 0  0   1   2  11  17 4.42  708/1436  4.42  4.42 4.29 4.24  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0   0   0   2   9  20 4.58  548/1432  4.58  4.71 4.29 4.23  4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 23  0   1   3   3   0 3.29 ****/1221  ****  4.49 3.93 3.86  ****

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0  0   0   1   5  18 4.71  261/1280  4.71  4.76 4.10 3.92  4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0   0   2   5  17 4.63  508/1277  4.63  4.77 4.34 4.13  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0  1   2   3  18 4.58  524/1269  4.58  4.76 4.31 4.04  4.58
4. Were special techniques successful                 10   2   2   0   5   5  10 3.95  475/ 854  3.95  4.23 4.02 3.87  3.95

            Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 32 0 0  0   1   0   1 4.00 ****/ 228  ****  **** 4.35 4.33  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 31 2  0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  79  ****  **** 4.58 4.13  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32 0  0   0   0   2   0 4.00 ****/  77  ****  **** 4.52 4.03  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 31 0  0   0   0   1   2 4.67 ****/  65  ****  **** 4.49 3.85  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   32   1   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  78  ****  **** 4.45 3.88  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               32   0   0   0   0   0   2 5.00 ****/  80  ****  **** 4.11 3.79  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 33 0  1   0   0   0   0 1.00 ****/  47  ****  **** 4.41 3.90  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 33 0  0   0   0   1   0 4.00 ****/  45  ****  **** 4.30 3.90  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      32   1   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  39  ****  **** 4.40 3.99  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  32   1   1   0   0   0   0 1.00 ****/  35  ****  **** 4.31 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 32 1  0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  34  ****  **** 4.30 4.11  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 32 0  0   0   0   2   0 4.00 ****/  37  ****  **** 4.63 4.53  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   32   1   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  23  ****  **** 4.41 4.19  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     32   0   0   0   0   1   1 4.50 ****/  33  ****  **** 4.69 4.57  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      32   1   0   0   0   0   1 5.00 ****/  22  ****  **** 4.54 4.31  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    32   1   0   0   0   1   0 4.00 ****/  18  ****  **** 4.49 4.11  ****
```

```
Course-Section: GWST 100  0101                    University of Maryland                          Page  852
Title          INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES                Baltimore County                             JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    KELBER-KAYE, JO                        Spring 2007                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      38
Questionnaires:  34                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                           Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned              Cum. GPA          Expected Grades           Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27    12            0.00-0.99    0        A   17        Required for Majors  13     Graduate     0        Major        0
 28-55     4            1.00-1.99    1        B   11
 56-83     3            2.00-2.99    7        C    2        General              14     Under-grad  34        Non-major   34
 84-150    5            3.00-3.49    9        D    0
 Grad.     0            3.50-4.00    0        F    0        Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                              P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                              I    0        Other                 5
                                              ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: GWST 100H 0101                  University of Maryland                              Page  853
Title                                            Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    KELBER-KAYE, JO                     Spring 2007                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       7
Questionnaires:   7                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                             Frequencies          Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
                 Questions               NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean    Rank     Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43   707/1522   4.43  4.51  4.30  4.14  4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3   3  4.29   844/1522   4.29  4.48  4.26  4.18  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   703/1476   4.33  4.55  4.22  4.09  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   119/1412   4.86  4.64  4.06  4.01  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   1   4   2  4.14   713/1381   4.14  4.45  4.08  3.93  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   0   2   4  4.29   750/1500   4.29  4.32  4.18  4.16  4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71   873/1517   4.71  4.05  4.65  4.62  4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0   0   0   6   1  4.14   782/1497   4.14  4.33  4.11  4.02  4.14


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   5   2  4.29  1023/1440   4.29  4.55  4.45  4.40  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00     1/1448   5.00  4.96  4.71  4.63  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   1   1   5  4.57   514/1436   4.57  4.42  4.29  4.24  4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86   227/1432   4.86  4.71  4.29  4.23  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6  0   0   0   1   0  4.00  ****/1221   ****  4.49  3.93  3.86  ****


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1280   5.00  4.76  4.10  3.92  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0   0   0   0   0   4  5.00     1/1277   5.00  4.77  4.34  4.13  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0   0   0   0   1   3  4.75   381/1269   4.75  4.76  4.31  4.04  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   1   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   287/ 854   4.33  4.23  4.02  3.87  4.33


                                          Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: GWST 322  0101                 University of Maryland                                      Page  854
Title        WOMEN AND THE MEDIA               Baltimore County                                          JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  HAGOVSKY, ELIZA                   Spring 2007                                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     43
Questionnaires: 33                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean  Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
        ----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   3  12  18  4.45  669/1522  4.60  4.51  4.30  4.34  4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   5  10  18  4.39  714/1522  4.60  4.48  4.26  4.25  4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  23   0   0   0   2   8  4.80  228/1285  4.90  4.85  4.30  4.30  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   2  11  19  4.53  444/1476  4.65  4.55  4.22  4.26  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   1   3   9  20  4.45  384/1412  4.62  4.64  4.06  4.03  4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0   0   0   4  11  18  4.42  413/1381  4.61  4.45  4.08  4.13  4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   6   7  19  4.33  700/1500  4.56  4.32  4.18  4.13  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   8  18   6   1  3.00 1506/1517  2.81  4.05  4.65  4.62  3.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1 0   1   5  16   5  3.93 1006/1497  4.01  4.33  4.11  4.13  3.93


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0   0   0   7  10  15  4.25 1047/1440  4.52  4.55  4.45  4.46  4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0   0   0   0   3  29  4.91  494/1448  4.91  4.96  4.71  4.71  4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0   0   0   4  11  17  4.41  720/1436  4.58  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0   0   0   3   8  20  4.55  590/1432  4.65  4.71  4.29  4.29  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2   0   0   7   4  19  4.40  359/1221  4.40  4.49  3.93  3.94  4.40


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   1   7  19  4.67  286/1280  4.79  4.76  4.10  4.14  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0   0   0   4  23  4.85  272/1277  4.81  4.77  4.34  4.38  4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0   0   0   0   3  24  4.89  244/1269  4.83  4.76  4.31  4.39  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   2   1   2   3   6  13  4.12  402/ 854  4.14  4.23  4.02  4.00  4.12


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.36  4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 228  ****  ****  4.35  4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 32 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.51  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  ****  4.42  4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  ****  4.23  4.26  ****


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 32  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  3.33  ****


              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.39  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.12  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     32   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  ****  ****
```

Title   WOMEN AND THE MEDIA   Baltimore County   JUN 26, 2007
Instructor: HAGOVSKY, ELIZA   Spring 2007   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 43
Questionnaires: 33   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
00-27   3   0.00-0.99   0   A   21   Required for Majors 11   Graduate   0   Major   0
28-55   3   1.00-1.99   1   B   10
56-83   5   2.00-2.99   5   C   0   General   10   Under-grad   33   Non-major   33
84-150   8   3.00-3.49   5   D   0
Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   10   F   0   Electives   1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0   responses to be significant
                                        I   0   Other   9
                                        ?   1

```
Course-Section: GWST 322  0301                  University of Maryland                                    Page  855
Title          WOMEN AND THE MEDIA              Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    HAGOVSKY, ELIZA                  Spring 2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      42
Questionnaires:  27                             Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

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

                  General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   5  21  4.74  335/1522  4.60  4.51  4.30  4.34  4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   0   0   5  21  4.81  201/1522  4.60  4.48  4.26  4.25  4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  18   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1285  4.90  4.85  4.30  4.30  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0   0   0   0   6  19  4.76  216/1476  4.65  4.55  4.22  4.26  4.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0   0   0   1   3  20  4.79  143/1412  4.62  4.64  4.06  4.03  4.79
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1  0   0   1   3  20  4.79  124/1381  4.61  4.45  4.08  4.13  4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3   0   0   0   0   5  19  4.79  170/1500  4.56  4.32  4.18  4.13  4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0   1  12  10   2   1  2.62 1513/1517  2.81  4.05  4.65  4.62  2.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1  0   0   5  10   7  4.09  839/1497  4.01  4.33  4.11  4.13  4.09


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   0   0   5  19  4.79  372/1440  4.52  4.55  4.45  4.46  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   0   2  22  4.92  444/1448  4.91  4.96  4.71  4.71  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   0   0   6  18  4.75  295/1436  4.58  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   0   0   0   6  18  4.75  350/1432  4.65  4.71  4.29  4.29  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0   2   0   1   4  16  4.39  366/1221  4.40  4.49  3.93  3.94  4.39


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   0   2  19  4.90  138/1280  4.79  4.76  4.10  4.14  4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0   0   0   1   3  17  4.76  363/1277  4.81  4.77  4.34  4.38  4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0   0   0   1   3  17  4.76  371/1269  4.83  4.76  4.31  4.39  4.76
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   1   0   0   6   5   9  4.15  385/ 854  4.14  4.23  4.02  4.00  4.15


                  Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 26 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 228  ****  ****  4.35  4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 26 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.51  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 216  ****  ****  4.42  4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/ 205  ****  ****  4.23  4.26  ****


                  Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                26   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  3.33  ****


                  Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 26   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.39  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   26   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.12  ****


                  Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 26  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    26   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      26   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       26   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     26   0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  ****  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	1	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	8	C	0	General	12	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: GWST 352  0101            University of Maryland                                         Page  856
Title       GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO         Baltimore County                                            JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  BENVENGA, MICHE               Spring 2007                                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   18
Questionnaires: 14                         Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies      Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean   Rank   Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course    0   0  0  0  0  5  9  4.64  453/1522  4.64  4.51  4.30  4.34  4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  164/1522  4.86  4.48  4.26  4.25  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   8  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  228/1285  4.80  4.85  4.30  4.30  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71  265/1476  4.71  4.55  4.22  4.26  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  4  8  4.54  322/1412  4.54  4.64  4.06  4.03  4.54
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  187/1381  4.69  4.45  4.08  4.13  4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   87/1500  4.92  4.32  4.18  4.13  4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  623/1517  4.85  4.05  4.65  4.62  4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  189/1497  4.75  4.33  4.11  4.13  4.75


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  272/1440  4.86  4.55  4.45  4.46  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  395/1448  4.93  4.96  4.71  4.71  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  170/1436  4.86  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  2 12  4.86  227/1432  4.86  4.71  4.29  4.29  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  2  2 10  4.57  232/1221  4.57  4.49  3.93  3.94  4.57


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1280  5.00  4.76  4.10  4.14  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  351/1277  4.78  4.77  4.34  4.38  4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5  0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  244/1269  4.89  4.76  4.31  4.39  4.89
4. Were special techniques successful                   5   0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  228/ 854  4.44  4.23  4.02  4.00  4.44


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material   12  1  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 215  ****  ****  4.36  4.21  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 13 0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 228  ****  ****  4.35  4.29  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 13 0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 217  ****  ****  4.51  4.45  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance            13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 216  ****  ****  4.42  4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 205  ****  ****  4.23  4.26  ****


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58  4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 13 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52  4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49  4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45  4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11  3.33  ****


               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned  13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  47  ****  ****  4.41  4.56  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria  13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  45  ****  ****  4.30  4.39  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation        13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.40  4.68  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations    13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  35  ****  ****  4.31  4.26  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  34  ****  ****  4.30  4.12  ****


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  37  ****  ****  4.63  5.00  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal     13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  23  ****  ****  4.41  ****  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful       13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  33  ****  ****  4.69  4.75  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful        13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  22  ****  ****  4.54  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      13  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  18  ****  ****  4.49  ****  ****
```

```
Course-Section: GWST 352  0101                 University of Maryland                              Page  856
Title           GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO          Baltimore County                                  JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:     BENVENGA, MICHE                 Spring 2007                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires: 14                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution


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

```
Course-Section: GWST 390G 0101              University of Maryland                           Page  857
Title       QUEER REPRESENT FILM/T          Baltimore County                                 JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:  KELBER-KAYE, JO                 Spring 2007                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires:  10                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies          Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
            Questions              NR  NA  1   2   3   4   5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
            General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  0   0   0   0   0   2   8  4.80  246/1522  4.80  4.51  4.30  4.34  4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0   0   0   0   5   5  4.50  545/1522  4.50  4.48  4.26  4.25  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   5   0   0   0   1   4  4.80  228/1285  4.80  4.85  4.30  4.30  4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1   0   0   0   0   2   7  4.78  207/1476  4.78  4.55  4.22  4.26  4.78
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   0   1   9  4.90  101/1412  4.90  4.64  4.06  4.03  4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0   0   0   0   1   2   7  4.60  247/1381  4.60  4.45  4.08  4.13  4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0   0   0   1   4   5  4.40  630/1500  4.40  4.32  4.18  4.13  4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1517  5.00  4.05  4.65  4.62  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  2   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  116/1497  4.88  4.33  4.11  4.13  4.88


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   0   2   1   7  4.50  798/1440  4.50  4.55  4.45  4.46  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0   0   0   0   0   0  10  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.96  4.71  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  1   0   0   0   0   6   3  4.33  793/1436  4.33  4.42  4.29  4.30  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   0   0   0   3   7  4.70  418/1432  4.70  4.71  4.29  4.29  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0   0   0   0   2   0   8  4.60  213/1221  4.60  4.49  3.93  3.94  4.60


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  2   0   0   0   0   2   6  4.75  222/1280  4.75  4.76  4.10  4.14  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  2   0   0   0   0   2   6  4.75  375/1277  4.75  4.77  4.34  4.38  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  2   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1269  5.00  4.76  4.31  4.39  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                 2   3   0   0   0   2   3  4.60  166/ 854  4.60  4.23  4.02  4.00  4.60


                                    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        1
  28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0       B    3                                                             
  56-83      2      2.00-2.99    3       C    1        General               4    Under-grad   10     Non-major    9
  84-150     4      3.00-3.49    1       D    1
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    2       F    0        Electives             2    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 3
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: GWST 390H 0101            University of Maryland                                  Page  858
Title          CULT POLI OF POPULATIO     Baltimore County                                       JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    MCCANN, CAROLE             Spring 2007                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      18
Questionnaires:  10                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor    Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank    Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  492/1522  4.60  4.51  4.30 4.34  4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  5  5  4.50  545/1522  4.50  4.48  4.26 4.25  4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   8  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  ****/1285  ****  4.85  4.30 4.30  ****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  5  4  4.30  735/1476  4.30  4.55  4.22 4.26  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  101/1412  4.90  4.64  4.06 4.03  4.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  1  3  6  4.50  331/1381  4.50  4.45  4.08 4.13  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  2  4  4  4.20  839/1500  4.20  4.32  4.18 4.13  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  3  6  1  3.80 1467/1517  3.80  4.05  4.65 4.62  3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0  3  4  3  4.00  898/1497  4.00  4.33  4.11 4.13  4.00


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  412/1440  4.78  4.55  4.45 4.46  4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.96  4.71 4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  2  5  2  4.00 1056/1436  4.00  4.42  4.29 4.30  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  2  6  4.56  579/1432  4.56  4.71  4.29 4.29  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 8 0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/1221  ****  4.49  3.93 3.94  ****


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  343/1280  4.57  4.76  4.10 4.14  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  547/1277  4.57  4.77  4.34 4.38  4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  532/1269  4.57  4.76  4.31 4.39  4.57


             Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  79  ****  ****  4.58 4.53  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 9 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  77  ****  ****  4.52 4.30  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  65  ****  ****  4.49 4.33  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  78  ****  ****  4.45 4.34  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                9   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  80  ****  ****  4.11 3.33  ****

                             Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors

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

```
Course-Section: GWST 495  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page  859
Title          RESEARCH & ACTIVISM SE         Baltimore County                                         JUN 26, 2007
Instructor:    MCCANN, CAROLE                 Spring 2007                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  6                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
             Questions                 NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean   Rank      Mean  Mean   Mean Mean  Mean
    ------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
                 General
 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   0   0   0   0   1   3   2  4.17  991/1522  4.17  4.51  4.30  4.42  4.17
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50  545/1522  4.50  4.48  4.26  4.34  4.50
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   5   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1285  ****  4.85  4.30  4.42  ****
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  316/1476  4.67  4.55  4.22  4.31  4.67
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   2   0   4  4.33  493/1412  4.33  4.64  4.06  4.11  4.33
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   1   0   2   3  4.17  693/1381  4.17  4.45  4.08  4.21  4.17
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   3   0   2  3.50 1298/1500  3.50  4.32  4.18  4.25  3.50
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50 1080/1517  4.50  4.05  4.65  4.71  4.50
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0   0   1   0   4  4.60  312/1497  4.60  4.33  4.11  4.21  4.60


                 Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   2   4  4.67  604/1440  4.67  4.55  4.45  4.52  4.67
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00    1/1448  5.00  4.96  4.71  4.75  5.00
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   1   1   1   3  4.00 1056/1436  4.00  4.42  4.29  4.32  4.00
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  254/1432  4.83  4.71  4.29  4.34  4.83
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 5  0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/1221  ****  4.49  3.93  4.04  ****


                 Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50  390/1280  4.50  4.76  4.10  4.28  4.50
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   1   5  4.83  290/1277  4.83  4.77  4.34  4.50  4.83
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   1   0   5  4.67  461/1269  4.67  4.76  4.31  4.49  4.67
 4. Were special techniques successful                  0   4   0   0   1   0   1  4.00  426/ 854  4.00  4.23  4.02  4.31  4.00


                                     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     1      Major        3
 28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0        B    0
 56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0        C    1       General               0     Under-grad   5      Non-major    3
 84-150     2       3.00-3.49    2        D    0
 Grad.      1       3.50-4.00    1        F    0       Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                          I    0       Other                 6
                                          ?    0
```