

Course-Section: MLL 190 0101
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1111
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	0	1	2	4	8	17	4.19	964/1639	4.47	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	4	7	18	4.22	895/1639	4.43	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	5	2	9	16	4.13	916/1397	4.38	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	2	4	6	15	4.14	900/1583	4.28	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	6	22	4.42	419/1532	4.46	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.42	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	3	2	9	5	10	3.59	1165/1504	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	9	18	4.31	743/1612	4.45	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	15	15	4.50	1135/1635	4.72	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	2	2	11	13	5	3.52	1313/1579	4.03	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.52	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	2	11	17	4.31	1042/1518	4.63	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	3	1	5	23	4.39	1279/1520	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.39	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	1	12	16	4.21	928/1517	4.48	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	5	1	6	17	4.00	1077/1550	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	7	8	15	4.19	505/1295	4.50	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	2	6	5	6	3.52	1099/1398	3.68	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.52	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	7	4	9	4.00	983/1391	4.06	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	2	4	7	7	3.81	1078/1388	4.17	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	16	0	2	0	1	2	3.60	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 15		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 3	General 4	Under-grad 33 Non-major 27
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 4	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 16	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MLL 190 0201
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1112
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	8	30	4.74	330/1639	4.47	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	28	4.64	371/1639	4.43	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	29	4.64	383/1397	4.38	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	2	3	6	20	4.42	584/1583	4.28	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.42	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	11	24	4.49	356/1532	4.46	4.10	4.01	3.88	4.49	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	2	5	7	18	4.18	678/1504	3.88	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	3	6	27	4.59	398/1612	4.45	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	36	4.95	397/1635	4.72	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	12	21	4.54	342/1579	4.03	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	37	4.95	128/1518	4.63	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	164/1520	4.68	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	9	28	4.76	299/1517	4.48	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	6	30	4.83	253/1550	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	5	29	4.80	109/1295	4.50	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	4	0	4	5	12	3.84	912/1398	3.68	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.84	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	0	5	5	14	4.12	927/1391	4.06	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.12	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	1	2	5	18	4.54	624/1388	4.17	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	23	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	36	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: MLL 190 0201
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T
 Enrollment: 52
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1112
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	39	Non-major	28
84-150	10	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MLL 210 0101
 Title AFRICA: LANG/CULTURE
 Instructor: KA, OMAR
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1113
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	2	15	4.55	561/1639	4.55	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	684/1639	4.40	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	4	12	4.30	749/1397	4.30	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	654/1583	4.37	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	256/1532	4.63	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	506/1504	4.39	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	11	4.42	603/1612	4.42	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	575/1518	4.68	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	328/1520	4.95	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	439/1517	4.63	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	242/1550	4.84	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.84	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	145/1295	4.74	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.74	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	380/1391	4.77	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	201/1388	4.92	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	6	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MLL 213 0101
 Title FILM AND SOCIETY SPAIN
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1114
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	7	10	4.19	951/1639	4.19	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	0	3	10	4	3.60	1444/1639	3.60	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	2	2	4	7	4.07	950/1397	4.07	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	7	7	3.85	1192/1583	3.85	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	8	7	4.00	774/1532	4.00	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	4	10	3.95	884/1504	3.95	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.95	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	5	3	4	4	5	3.05	1515/1612	3.05	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.05	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	3	2	8	3	3.39	1371/1579	3.39	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.39	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	0	4	11	4.05	1220/1518	4.05	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.05	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	837/1520	4.79	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	4	0	8	6	3.74	1245/1550	3.74	4.27	4.22	4.33	3.74	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	1	2	2	13	4.32	413/1295	4.32	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.32	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	920/1398	3.82	4.18	4.07	4.14	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	1	4	4	6	3.81	1118/1391	3.81	4.51	4.30	4.35	3.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	2	2	1	3	8	3.81	1073/1388	3.81	4.35	4.28	4.37	3.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	5	3	4	2	1	1	2.36	930/ 958	2.36	4.02	3.93	4.00	2.36	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6	General 6	Under-grad 21	Non-major 20
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 4			
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1115
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	8	24	4.46	684/1639	4.46	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	25	4.54	476/1639	4.54	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	31	4.78	250/1397	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	1	5	4	19	4.30	741/1583	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	10	23	4.44	398/1532	4.44	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	2	2	9	13	4.04	807/1504	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	7	23	4.42	617/1612	4.42	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	397/1635	4.94	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	5	14	12	4.23	691/1579	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	10	25	4.62	656/1518	4.54	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	8	29	4.78	837/1520	4.78	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	10	24	4.51	584/1517	4.45	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	8	22	4.38	796/1550	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	5	12	15	4.31	413/1295	4.30	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	3	6	11	4.09	738/1398	4.09	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	4	14	4.32	769/1391	4.32	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	616/1388	4.55	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	344/ 958	4.26	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.26	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors								
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	23		
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12								
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	37	Non-major	14		
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0								
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					
				P	0								
				I	0				Other	32			
				?	1								

Course-Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 53
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1116
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	8	24	4.46	684/1639	4.46	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.46	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	8	25	4.54	476/1639	4.54	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	31	4.78	250/1397	4.78	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	1	1	5	4	19	4.30	741/1583	4.30	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.30	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	10	23	4.44	398/1532	4.44	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	2	2	2	9	13	4.04	807/1504	4.04	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.04	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	7	23	4.42	617/1612	4.42	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	34	4.94	397/1635	4.94	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	13	0	0	0	7	9	8	4.04	865/1579	4.13	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	863/1518	4.54	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	0	6	20	4.77	872/1520	4.78	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	747/1517	4.45	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	690/1550	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.42	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	1	0	0	5	8	12	4.28	436/1295	4.30	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	2	0	3	6	11	4.09	738/1398	4.09	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	4	14	4.32	769/1391	4.32	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.32	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	616/1388	4.55	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.55	
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	344/ 958	4.26	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.26	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	20	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	37	Non-major	14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MLL 250 0101
 Title INTRO FREN-SPEAKING WR
 Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1117
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	2	4	4	3.91	1252/1639	3.91	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	4	2	3.45	1501/1639	3.45	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	2	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.67		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	0	4	3.89	1171/1583	3.89	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.89	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	388/1532	4.45	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	429/1504	4.45	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	982/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	4.09	1458/1635	4.09	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	757/1518	4.55	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	768/1517	4.36	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	953/1550	4.18	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	1053/1295	3.36	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	4	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	839/1391	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	609/1388	4.56	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	6	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	658/ 958	3.67	4.02	3.93	4.00	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 270 0101
 Title RUSSIAN CULTURE/CIVIL
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1118
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	188/1639	4.89	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	466/1639	4.56	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	467/1397	4.56	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	423/1583	4.56	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	133/1532	4.83	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	11	4.39	506/1504	4.39	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	656/1612	4.39	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.39	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1195/1635	4.44	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	128/1518	4.94	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	214/1517	4.83	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	196/1550	4.89	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	49/1295	4.94	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	355/1398	4.63	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	255/1388	4.88	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	386/ 958	4.18	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: MLL 270 0101
 Title RUSSIAN CULTURE/CIVIL
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1118
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 305 0101
 Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1119
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	4	14	4.50	615/1639	4.50	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	0	5	12	4.25	859/1639	4.25	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	661/1397	4.40	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	7	6	3.80	1226/1583	3.80	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	5	10	4.15	663/1532	4.15	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	7	9	4.05	797/1504	4.05	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	3	3	9	2	2	2.84	1554/1612	2.84	4.02	4.16	4.12	2.84	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	811/1635	4.80	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	0	4	10	4.38	527/1579	4.38	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	1	2	15	4.45	891/1518	4.45	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	328/1520	4.95	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	0	3	15	4.55	535/1517	4.55	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.55	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	16	4.60	522/1550	4.60	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	505/1295	4.20	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	172/1398	4.89	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	248/1391	4.89	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	296/1388	4.83	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	91/ 958	4.83	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.83	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.08	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Non-major 20
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 1
					Other 6

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 328 0101
 Title CHINESE FICTION & DRAM
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1120
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1	8	10	4.35	797/1639	4.35	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	4.40	684/1639	4.40	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	342/1397	4.70	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	7	4.25	792/1583	4.25	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	125/1532	4.85	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	7	4	8	4.05	797/1504	4.05	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	9	9	4.35	694/1612	4.35	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	2	4.11	1454/1635	4.11	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	646/1579	4.27	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	616/1518	4.65	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.65	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	328/1520	4.95	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	674/1517	4.45	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.45	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	580/1550	4.55	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	7	3	8	3.95	687/1295	3.95	3.77	3.94	3.95	3.95	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	460/1398	4.47	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.47	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	4	3	2	3.78	596/ 958	3.78	4.02	3.93	3.97	3.78	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	

Course-Section: MLL 328 0101
 Title CHINESE FICTION & DRAM
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1120
 FEB 13, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

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	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	20	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 406 0101
 Title INTERCULTURAL MEDIA TH
 Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1121
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	3	5	4.10	1068/1639	4.10	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.10	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	915/1639	4.20	4.15	4.22	4.29	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.37	4.28	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	371/1583	4.60	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.07	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.04	4.05	4.20	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1253/1612	3.80	4.02	4.16	4.18	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1135/1635	4.50	4.38	4.65	4.72	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1056/1579	3.90	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1069/1518	4.29	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	1136/1520	4.57	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	700/1517	4.43	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	556/1550	4.57	4.27	4.22	4.24	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	155/1295	4.71	3.77	3.94	4.01	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	735/1398	4.10	4.18	4.07	4.23	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	863/1391	4.20	4.51	4.30	4.48	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	399/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.24	4.17	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		9
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 603 0101
 Title POLI ECONOMY OF CULTUR
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1122
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	8	4.73	354/1639	4.73	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	284/1639	4.73	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	313/1397	4.73	4.37	4.28	4.37	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	434/1583	4.55	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.55	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	146/1532	4.80	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	667/1504	4.20	4.04	4.05	4.29	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	388/1612	4.60	4.02	4.16	4.27	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	811/1635	4.80	4.38	4.65	4.81	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	312/1579	4.57	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.23	4.43	4.49	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.90	4.67	4.70	4.79	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.15	4.27	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	522/1550	4.60	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	3	1	4	3.70	871/1295	3.70	3.77	3.94	3.95	3.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	329/1398	4.67	4.18	4.07	4.22	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.51	4.30	4.47	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	546/1388	4.63	4.35	4.28	4.49	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	364/ 958	4.22	4.02	3.93	4.01	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

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

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	5	5	6	3.94	1206/1639	3.94	4.22	4.27	4.42	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	6	3	3.59	1451/1639	3.59	4.15	4.22	4.26	3.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1397	****	4.37	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	4.06	974/1583	4.06	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	323/1532	4.53	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	576/1504	4.29	4.04	4.05	4.29	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	4	2	8	3.88	1198/1612	3.88	4.02	4.16	4.27	3.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1366/1635	4.24	4.38	4.65	4.81	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1125/1579	3.82	4.00	4.08	4.17	3.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1385/1518	3.71	4.23	4.43	4.49	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	1129/1520	4.59	4.67	4.70	4.79	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	5	1	8	3.76	1256/1517	3.76	4.15	4.27	4.32	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	6	6	3.71	1259/1550	3.71	4.27	4.22	4.23	3.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	1	4	0	3	3.63	917/1295	3.63	3.77	3.94	3.95	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	688/1398	4.18	4.18	4.07	4.22	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	454/1391	4.71	4.51	4.30	4.47	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	307/1388	4.82	4.35	4.28	4.49	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	284/ 958	4.38	4.02	3.93	4.01	4.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	3.96	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.58	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.74	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.52	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.50	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	1	0	3	0	3.50	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.37	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.64	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.03	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	3	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				

Course-Section: MLL 750D 0101
 Title U.S. IMMIGRATION POLIC
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1124
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	2	1	3.75	1358/1639	3.75	4.22	4.27	4.42	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	3.25	1553/1639	3.25	4.15	4.22	4.26	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	580/1532	4.25	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.29	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	3.25	1474/1612	3.25	4.02	4.16	4.27	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.38	4.65	4.81	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	1318/1579	3.50	4.00	4.08	4.17	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	1481/1518	3.00	4.23	4.43	4.49	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1347/1517	3.50	4.15	4.27	4.32	3.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1328/1550	3.50	4.27	4.22	4.23	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	623/1295	4.00	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.18	4.07	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1146/1391	3.75	4.51	4.30	4.47	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1095/1388	3.75	4.35	4.28	4.49	3.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	4.02	3.93	4.01	3.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.75	4.11	3.96	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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