

Course-Section: LLC 600B 0101
 Title INTRO LANG LIT & CULT
 Instructor: BICKEL, BEVERLY
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1010
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 665/1670 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 4.20 | 1037/1666 | 4.20 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.20 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/1406 | **** | 4.63 | 4.32 | 4.36 | **** |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 4.60 | 446/1615 | 4.60 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.33 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.20 | 706/1566 | 4.20 | 4.18 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.20 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4.30 | 662/1528 | 4.30 | 4.59 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 4.30 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3.78 | 1347/1650 | 3.78 | 4.37 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 3.78 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 675/1667 | 4.90 | 4.77 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 4.90 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4.00 | 953/1626 | 4.00 | 4.39 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.33 | 1092/1559 | 4.33 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.50 | 1248/1560 | 4.50 | 4.92 | 4.72 | 4.81 | 4.50 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3.89 | 1246/1549 | 3.89 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 3.89 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 4.11 | 1095/1546 | 4.11 | 4.58 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.11 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3.83 | 871/1323 | 3.83 | 3.47 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 3.83 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.30 | 638/1384 | 4.30 | 4.51 | 4.10 | 4.21 | 4.30 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4.60 | 525/1378 | 4.60 | 4.64 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 4.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 386/1378 | 4.80 | 4.81 | 4.31 | 4.51 | 4.80 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 3.88 | 580/ 904 | 3.88 | 3.82 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 3.88 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4.00 | 74/ 87 | 4.00 | 4.50 | 4.65 | 4.61 | 4.00 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 66/ 79 | 4.25 | 4.63 | 4.64 | 4.67 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 54/ 75 | 4.25 | 4.50 | 4.57 | 4.66 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 55/ 79 | 4.25 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.58 | 4.25 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | 65/ 80 | 3.25 | 4.13 | 3.97 | 4.32 | 3.25 |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | A 9 | Required for Majors | 0 Graduate 6 Major 10 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 0 | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 0 Under-grad 4 Non-major 0 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 6 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 10 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LLC 635 0101
 Title SOC CULT LRNG THEOR
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1011
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| 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 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 1216/1670 | 4.00 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3.60 | 1479/1666 | 3.60 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.60 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.25 | 1531/1615 | 3.25 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.33 | 3.25 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 339/1566 | 4.60 | 4.18 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.60 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 1122/1528 | 3.80 | 4.59 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 3.80 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.40 | 1503/1650 | 3.40 | 4.37 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 3.40 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4.20 | 1409/1667 | 4.20 | 4.77 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 4.20 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 728/1626 | 4.25 | 4.39 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.25 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 1280/1559 | 4.00 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1560 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.72 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3.50 | 1389/1549 | 3.50 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 3.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 919/1546 | 4.33 | 4.58 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | 1318/1323 | 1.00 | 3.47 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 1.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 541/1384 | 4.40 | 4.51 | 4.10 | 4.21 | 4.40 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 3.60 | 1156/1378 | 3.60 | 4.64 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 3.60 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 751/1378 | 4.40 | 4.81 | 4.31 | 4.51 | 4.40 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.67 | 891/ 904 | 1.67 | 3.82 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 1.67 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 87 | **** | 4.50 | 4.65 | 4.61 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 79 | **** | 4.63 | 4.64 | 4.67 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 75 | **** | 4.50 | 4.57 | 4.66 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 79 | **** | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.58 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 80 | **** | 4.13 | 3.97 | 4.32 | **** |

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

Course-Section: LLC 648 0101
 Title RESEARCH WRITING
 Instructor: TRUSCELLO, DAVI
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1012
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 665/1670 | 4.50 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1666 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 379/1615 | 4.67 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.33 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4.33 | 559/1566 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.33 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 300/1528 | 4.67 | 4.59 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 4.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 361/1650 | 4.67 | 4.37 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 4.67 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1667 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 207/1626 | 4.75 | 4.39 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 387/1559 | 4.83 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1560 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.72 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 266/1549 | 4.83 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 4.83 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 520/1546 | 4.67 | 4.58 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 692/1323 | 4.00 | 3.47 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 324/1384 | 4.67 | 4.51 | 4.10 | 4.21 | 4.67 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1378 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1378 | 5.00 | 4.81 | 4.31 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 904 | 5.00 | 3.82 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 5.00 |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 28 | **** | **** | 4.64 | 4.82 | **** |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 650 0101
 Title ADV QUALITATIVE METHOD
 Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1013
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1670 | 5.00 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1666 | 5.00 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1406 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 210/1615 | 4.86 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.33 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 258/1566 | 4.71 | 4.18 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.71 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1528 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 194/1650 | 4.86 | 4.37 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 4.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1667 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 141/1626 | 4.86 | 4.39 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.86 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1559 | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1560 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.72 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1549 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1546 | 5.00 | 4.58 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4.00 | 692/1323 | 4.00 | 3.47 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 195/1384 | 4.86 | 4.51 | 4.10 | 4.21 | 4.86 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1378 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1378 | 5.00 | 4.81 | 4.31 | 4.51 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.14 | 425/ 904 | 4.14 | 3.82 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 4.14 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 87 | 5.00 | 4.50 | 4.65 | 4.61 | 5.00 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 79 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.64 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 41/ 75 | 4.75 | 4.50 | 4.57 | 4.66 | 4.75 |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 79 | 5.00 | 4.63 | 4.45 | 4.58 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/ 80 | 5.00 | 4.13 | 3.97 | 4.32 | 5.00 |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 24/ 41 | 4.86 | 4.86 | 4.50 | 4.65 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 15/ 38 | 4.71 | 4.71 | 4.19 | 4.58 | 4.71 |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 19/ 38 | 4.86 | 4.86 | 4.62 | 4.65 | 4.86 |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 13/ 39 | 4.86 | 4.86 | 4.27 | 4.59 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 14/ 31 | 4.80 | 4.80 | 4.47 | 4.59 | 4.80 |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750D 0101
 Title TPCS:LANGUAGE AND GEND
 Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1014
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| 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 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 902/1670 | 4.33 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.17 | 1070/1666 | 4.17 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.17 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 876/1406 | 4.25 | 4.63 | 4.32 | 4.36 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.67 | 379/1615 | 4.67 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.33 | 4.67 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 258/1566 | 4.71 | 4.18 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 4.71 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 173/1528 | 4.80 | 4.59 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 4.80 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 570/1650 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 1157/1667 | 4.50 | 4.77 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 403/1626 | 4.50 | 4.39 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 387/1559 | 4.83 | 4.60 | 4.46 | 4.49 | 4.83 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1560 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.72 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4.50 | 683/1549 | 4.50 | 4.34 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 345/1546 | 4.80 | 4.58 | 4.32 | 4.40 | 4.80 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 326/1323 | 4.50 | 3.47 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.50 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.33 | 608/1384 | 4.33 | 4.51 | 4.10 | 4.21 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 481/1378 | 4.67 | 4.64 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 531/1378 | 4.67 | 4.81 | 4.31 | 4.51 | 4.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4.40 | 289/ 904 | 4.40 | 3.82 | 4.03 | 4.04 | 4.40 |

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 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B 0 | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 2 | General 3 | Under-grad 9 | Non-major 9 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | 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: LLC 890 0101
 Title RES PROPOSAL SEMINAR
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1015
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | NR | NA | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|---|----|----|-------------|---|---|---|---|------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-----------|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | | | | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 1537/1670 | 3.50 | 4.31 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 3.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 622/1666 | 4.50 | 4.41 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1615 | 5.00 | 4.51 | 4.24 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | 1537/1566 | 2.50 | 4.18 | 4.07 | 4.20 | 2.50 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1528 | 5.00 | 4.59 | 4.12 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1650 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.22 | 4.30 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1667 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.67 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | 953/1626 | 4.00 | 4.39 | 4.11 | 4.20 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1560 | 5.00 | 4.92 | 4.72 | 4.81 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 434/1384 | 4.50 | 4.51 | 4.10 | 4.21 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1378 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.29 | 4.42 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1378 | 5.00 | 4.81 | 4.31 | 4.51 | 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 | 2 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B | 0 | | | | | | |
| 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. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant | | | |
| | | | | P | 2 | | | | | | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |