

Course-Section: MLL 191 0101
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVE
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1003
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	6	3	14	4.04	1050/1481	4.04	4.09	4.29	4.14	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	5	15	4.19	884/1481	4.19	4.08	4.23	4.18	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	7	14	4.23	757/1249	4.23	4.18	4.27	4.14	4.23	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	1	6	3	8	3.84	1130/1424	3.84	4.12	4.21	4.06	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	6	11	3.85	846/1396	3.85	3.97	3.98	3.89	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	3	4	4	4	3.29	1197/1342	3.29	3.98	4.07	3.88	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	2	3	17	4.19	827/1459	4.19	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	839/1480	4.81	4.61	4.68	4.64	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	1	7	8	5	3.81	1055/1450	3.81	3.78	4.09	3.97	3.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	2	20	4.58	682/1409	4.58	4.11	4.42	4.36	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	200/1407	4.96	4.58	4.69	4.57	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	5	16	4.35	743/1399	4.35	4.05	4.26	4.23	4.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	3	19	4.46	636/1400	4.46	4.03	4.27	4.19	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	1	6	7	7	3.82	753/1179	3.82	3.89	3.96	3.85	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	3	1	7	3	3.71	907/1262	3.71	4.12	4.05	3.77	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	3	1	6	3	3.50	1094/1259	3.50	4.36	4.29	4.06	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	797/1256	4.21	4.58	4.30	4.08	4.21	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	12	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 788	****	3.99	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 13	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 26 Non-major 1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 9	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MLL 220 0101
 Title FILM & SOCIETY IN CHIN
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1004
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	8	9	4.14	976/1481	4.14	4.09	4.29	4.40	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	589/1481	4.45	4.08	4.23	4.29	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	598/1249	4.43	4.18	4.27	4.36	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	310/1424	4.64	4.12	4.21	4.28	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	10	9	4.23	527/1396	4.23	3.97	3.98	3.94	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	405/1342	4.41	3.98	4.07	4.05	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	7	12	4.41	611/1459	4.41	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	825/1480	4.82	4.61	4.68	4.68	4.82	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	546/1450	4.33	3.78	4.09	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	383/1409	4.78	4.11	4.42	4.47	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.58	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	289/1399	4.74	4.05	4.26	4.29	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	274/1400	4.79	4.03	4.27	4.34	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	53/1179	4.95	3.89	3.96	4.05	4.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	335/1262	4.53	4.12	4.05	4.11	4.53	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	615/1259	4.47	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.47	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	532/1256	4.58	4.58	4.30	4.28	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	15	2	0	0	0	2	3.00	****/ 788	****	3.99	4.00	3.98	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	8	C 0	General 11
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Non-major 7
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 2

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 280 0101
 Title INTRO SPAN SPKNG WORLD
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1005
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	4	2	2	3	6	3.29	1417/1481	3.29	4.09	4.29	4.40	3.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	2	3	3	4	2.94	1433/1481	2.94	4.08	4.23	4.29	2.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	4	7	3.82	1013/1249	3.82	4.18	4.27	4.36	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	0	4	6	3	3.38	1305/1424	3.38	4.12	4.21	4.28	3.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	2	4	2	5	3.25	1199/1396	3.25	3.97	3.98	3.94	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	1	3	4	3	2.94	1292/1342	2.94	3.98	4.07	4.05	2.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	3	2	3	2	2.50	1429/1459	2.50	4.11	4.16	4.17	2.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	1267/1480	4.19	4.61	4.68	4.68	4.19	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	7	5	0	2	2.56	1424/1450	2.56	3.78	4.09	4.15	2.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	3	7	2	1	2.80	1384/1409	2.80	4.11	4.42	4.47	2.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	2	1	4	8	4.20	1277/1407	4.20	4.58	4.69	4.78	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	5	1	5	3	1	2.60	1375/1399	2.60	4.05	4.26	4.29	2.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	7	2	1	2	3	2.47	1368/1400	2.47	4.03	4.27	4.34	2.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	2	1	5	3	3.38	952/1179	3.38	3.89	3.96	4.05	3.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	3	4	2	3.14	1117/1262	3.14	4.12	4.05	4.11	3.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	5	2	6	3.93	961/1259	3.93	4.36	4.29	4.34	3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	1	1	5	5	3.71	1055/1256	3.71	4.58	4.30	4.28	3.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	3	1	3	2	3.00	713/ 788	3.00	3.99	4.00	3.98	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.55	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 17	Non-major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 2			

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1006
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	10	17	13	3.84	1199/1481	3.84	4.09	4.29	4.29	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	15	19	4.14	934/1481	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.23	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	13	25	4.41	624/1249	4.41	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	15	21	4.40	557/1424	4.40	4.12	4.21	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	4	6	15	14	3.92	782/1396	3.93	3.97	3.98	4.00	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	20	16	4.14	660/1342	4.14	3.98	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	10	27	4.36	659/1459	4.36	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	7	30	6	3.93	1398/1480	3.93	4.61	4.68	4.65	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	11	11	13	4.00	836/1450	4.03	3.78	4.09	4.10	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	3	17	19	4.21	1055/1409	4.11	4.11	4.42	4.43	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	11	28	4.57	1053/1407	4.62	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	7	13	19	4.17	901/1399	4.07	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	1	4	10	23	4.12	977/1400	4.08	4.03	4.27	4.28	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	4	5	10	20	4.18	503/1179	4.12	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	2	4	8	11	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.12	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	564/1259	4.54	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	2	2	3	19	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.58	4.30	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	347/ 788	4.14	3.99	4.00	4.07	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1006
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	31	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	7
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	10	17	13	3.84	1199/1481	3.84	4.09	4.29	4.29	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	8	15	19	4.14	934/1481	4.14	4.08	4.23	4.23	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	13	25	4.41	624/1249	4.41	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	3	15	21	4.40	557/1424	4.40	4.12	4.21	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	4	6	15	14	3.92	782/1396	3.93	3.97	3.98	4.00	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	20	16	4.14	660/1342	4.14	3.98	4.07	4.12	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	10	27	4.36	659/1459	4.36	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	7	30	6	3.93	1398/1480	3.93	4.61	4.68	4.65	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	0	0	0	10	7	12	4.07	803/1450	4.03	3.78	4.09	4.10	4.03	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	2	1	3	13	11	4.00	1152/1409	4.11	4.11	4.42	4.43	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	14	0	0	0	2	6	22	4.67	963/1407	4.62	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	1	0	8	10	10	3.97	1039/1399	4.07	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	1	3	8	15	4.03	1007/1400	4.08	4.03	4.27	4.28	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	0	0	2	7	7	13	4.07	570/1179	4.12	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.12	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	2	4	8	11	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.12	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	1	1	7	17	4.54	564/1259	4.54	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	2	2	3	19	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.58	4.30	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	18	5	0	1	5	5	10	4.14	347/ 788	4.14	3.99	4.00	4.07	4.14	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1007
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	31	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	44	Non-major	7
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	13	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	8	33	4.68	373/1481	4.68	4.09	4.29	4.29	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	34	4.68	299/1481	4.68	4.08	4.23	4.23	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	37	4.77	228/1249	4.77	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	68/1424	4.96	4.12	4.21	4.27	4.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	0	9	32	4.60	241/1396	4.60	3.97	3.98	4.00	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	19	0	1	0	2	22	4.80	112/1342	4.80	3.98	4.07	4.12	4.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	42	4.95	51/1459	4.95	4.11	4.16	4.17	4.95	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	23	17	4.43	1100/1480	4.43	4.61	4.68	4.65	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	3	1	0	0	8	21	4.60	259/1450	4.60	3.78	4.09	4.10	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	6	36	4.79	350/1409	4.79	4.11	4.42	4.43	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	40	4.91	500/1407	4.91	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	6	36	4.79	223/1399	4.79	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	36	4.70	385/1400	4.70	4.03	4.27	4.28	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	7	30	4.68	172/1179	4.68	3.89	3.96	4.02	4.68	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	220/1262	4.73	4.12	4.05	4.14	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.36	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.58	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	19	12	2	0	0	1	10	4.31	270/ 788	4.31	3.99	4.00	4.07	4.31	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.20	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	4.23	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	****	4.40	4.36	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	3.96	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	****	4.04	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	4.43	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.48	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	4.13	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.33	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	3.90	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.88	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.88	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	4.67	****	

Course-Section: MLL 305 0101
 Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 202
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1008
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	27	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	44	Non-major	13
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 332 0101
 Title TOPICS IN GERMAN CULTU
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1009
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.09	4.29	4.29	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.08	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.18	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.12	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	136/1396	4.75	3.97	3.98	4.00	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.98	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1256/1459	3.50	4.11	4.16	4.17	3.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.61	4.68	4.65	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	630/1450	4.25	3.78	4.09	4.10	4.25	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.11	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.58	4.69	4.67	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.05	4.26	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.03	4.27	4.28	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1041/1179	3.00	3.89	3.96	4.02	3.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.12	4.05	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.36	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.58	4.30	4.34	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 470 0101
 Title L2 ACQUISITION/LEARNIN
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1010
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	5	5	3.87	1187/1481	3.87	4.09	4.29	4.45	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	4	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.32	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1249	****	4.18	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	0	7	5	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.12	4.21	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	839/1396	3.86	3.97	3.98	4.09	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	573/1342	4.21	3.98	4.07	4.21	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	378/1459	4.57	4.11	4.16	4.25	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.61	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	10	2	4.00	836/1450	4.00	3.78	4.09	4.28	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.11	4.42	4.51	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	963/1407	4.67	4.58	4.69	4.79	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	819/1399	4.27	4.05	4.26	4.36	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.03	4.27	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	566/1179	4.08	3.89	3.96	4.07	4.08	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	7	1	3.67	931/1262	3.67	4.12	4.05	4.33	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	0	2	8	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.36	4.29	4.57	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	571/1256	4.50	4.58	4.30	4.60	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	3.99	4.00	4.26	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 601 0101
 Title INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATI
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1011
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	4	7	11	4.22	896/1481	4.22	4.09	4.29	4.28	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	7	7	3.78	1189/1481	3.78	4.08	4.23	4.11	3.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	0	3	6	9	3.73	1061/1249	3.73	4.18	4.27	4.24	3.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	9	6	3.61	1242/1424	3.61	4.12	4.21	4.16	3.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	5	10	3.91	801/1396	3.91	3.97	3.98	4.00	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	6	5	8	3.86	920/1342	3.86	3.98	4.07	4.18	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	4	15	4.39	623/1459	4.39	4.11	4.16	4.01	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	702/1480	4.91	4.61	4.68	4.74	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	5	8	4	3.68	1151/1450	3.68	3.78	4.09	3.96	3.68	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	4	3	5	10	3.83	1234/1409	3.83	4.11	4.42	4.36	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	2	2	18	4.61	1031/1407	4.61	4.58	4.69	4.73	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	3	6	9	3.70	1185/1399	3.70	4.05	4.26	4.16	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	9	7	3.65	1187/1400	3.65	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	1	8	1	2	2.87	1091/1179	2.87	3.89	3.96	3.81	2.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	6	9	3.95	752/1262	3.95	4.12	4.05	4.07	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	3	3	3	11	3.95	936/1259	3.95	4.36	4.29	4.30	3.95	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	3	4	14	4.36	704/1256	4.36	4.58	4.30	4.33	4.36	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	2	6	3	4	4	3.11	710/ 788	3.11	3.99	4.00	3.97	3.11	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	4.49	4.23	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.53	4.46	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	****	4.35	4.16	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	****	3.92	3.71	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	****	4.30	4.01	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.00	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.60	4.65	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.26	4.27	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.55	4.38	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.75	4.95	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	****	4.65	4.54	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.83	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.82	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	9	0.00-0.99 0	A 16	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 10 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	22	
?	1			

Course-Section: MLL 602 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1012
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	5	6	3.63	1311/1481	3.63	4.09	4.29	4.28	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	3.95	1070/1481	3.95	4.08	4.23	4.11	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.18	4.27	4.24	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	9	5	3.89	1101/1424	3.89	4.12	4.21	4.16	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	675/1396	4.05	3.97	3.98	4.00	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	8	6	3.84	927/1342	3.84	3.98	4.07	4.18	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	1063/1459	3.89	4.11	4.16	4.01	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.61	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	9	4	4.21	672/1450	2.93	3.78	4.09	3.96	2.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	275/1409	3.61	4.11	4.42	4.36	3.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	766/1407	4.13	4.58	4.69	4.73	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	491/1399	3.47	4.05	4.26	4.16	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	521/1400	3.32	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	9	9	4.42	323/1179	3.35	3.89	3.96	3.81	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	666/1262	4.11	4.12	4.05	4.07	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	803/1259	4.22	4.36	4.29	4.30	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	394/1256	4.72	4.58	4.30	4.33	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	382/ 788	4.06	3.99	4.00	3.97	4.06	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 602 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1013
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	4	5	6	3.63	1311/1481	3.63	4.09	4.29	4.28	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	3.95	1070/1481	3.95	4.08	4.23	4.11	3.95	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	9	6	4.11	846/1249	4.11	4.18	4.27	4.24	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	9	5	3.89	1101/1424	3.89	4.12	4.21	4.16	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	9	6	4.05	675/1396	4.05	3.97	3.98	4.00	4.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	8	6	3.84	927/1342	3.84	3.98	4.07	4.18	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	6	5	6	3.89	1063/1459	3.89	4.11	4.16	4.01	3.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.61	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	10	2	0	1	1	1.64	1446/1450	2.93	3.78	4.09	3.96	2.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	5	7	3	3	1	2.37	1400/1409	3.61	4.11	4.42	4.36	3.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	2	4	7	4	3.47	1374/1407	4.13	4.58	4.69	4.73	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	7	5	2	3	2	2.37	1391/1399	3.47	4.05	4.26	4.16	3.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	9	4	1	3	1	2.06	1392/1400	3.32	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	6	2	3	2	1	2.29	1147/1179	3.35	3.89	3.96	3.81	3.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	7	4.11	666/1262	4.11	4.12	4.05	4.07	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	803/1259	4.22	4.36	4.29	4.30	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	394/1256	4.72	4.58	4.30	4.33	4.72	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	382/ 788	4.06	3.99	4.00	3.97	4.06	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 625 0101
 Title INTER/CROSS-CULT COMMU
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1014
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	95/1481	4.94	4.09	4.29	4.28	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	169/1481	4.82	4.08	4.23	4.11	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	10	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.18	4.27	4.24	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	740/1424	4.25	4.12	4.21	4.16	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	209/1396	4.65	3.97	3.98	4.00	4.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	494/1342	4.31	3.98	4.07	4.18	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	1	5	7	3.88	1071/1459	3.88	4.11	4.16	4.01	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	421/1480	4.94	4.61	4.68	4.74	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	6	7	4.29	599/1450	4.29	3.78	4.09	3.96	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	400/1409	4.76	4.11	4.42	4.36	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	300/1407	4.94	4.58	4.69	4.73	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	195/1399	4.82	4.05	4.26	4.16	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	374/1400	4.71	4.03	4.27	4.17	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	7	7	4.33	384/1179	4.33	3.89	3.96	3.81	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	138/1262	4.88	4.12	4.05	4.07	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	148/1259	4.94	4.36	4.29	4.30	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.58	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	105/ 788	4.75	3.99	4.00	3.97	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	****	4.20	4.27	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	****	4.11	3.93	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.20	4.15	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	5	A 14	Required for Majors 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Under-grad 10
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Non-major 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Electives 0
					Other 15

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 695 0101
 Title INTERCULT VIDEO PROD I
 Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1015
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.09	4.29	4.28	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	4.08	4.23	4.11	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1193/1249	3.00	4.18	4.27	4.24	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.12	4.21	4.16	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1368/1396	2.50	3.97	3.98	4.00	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	755/1342	4.00	3.98	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.11	4.16	4.01	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.61	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1098/1450	3.75	3.78	4.09	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1293/1409	3.50	4.11	4.42	4.36	3.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1257/1407	4.25	4.58	4.69	4.73	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1163/1399	3.75	4.05	4.26	4.16	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1230/1400	3.50	4.03	4.27	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	259/1179	4.50	3.89	3.96	3.81	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	887/1262	3.75	4.12	4.05	4.07	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.36	4.29	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	357/1256	4.75	4.58	4.30	4.33	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	3.99	4.00	3.97	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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