

Course-Section: WMST 100 0101
 Title INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES
 Instructor: SPURGAS, ALYSON
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1479
 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	2	3	12	4.59	478/1481	4.59	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	779/1481	4.29	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	321/1396	4.47	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	12	5	4.29	511/1342	4.29	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	11	4.41	595/1459	4.41	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	2	4.12	1316/1480	4.12	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	7	4	4.15	732/1450	4.15	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	727/1409	4.53	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	350/1407	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	613/1399	4.47	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	636/1400	4.47	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1027/1179	3.14	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	670/1259	4.42	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	2	5	2	3.55	596/ 788	3.55	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.55	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	17	Non-major	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: WMST 100H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1480
 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	5	4.83	210/1481	4.83	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.14	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	695/1459	4.33	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1450	5.00	4.10	4.09	3.97	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	1086/1409	4.17	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	753/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1179	****	3.94	3.96	3.85	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: WMST 322 0101
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: HAGOVSKY, ELIZA
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1481
 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	3	1	3	12	8	3.78	1242/1481	3.99	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	2	13	8	3.85	1148/1481	4.20	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	0	3	8	13	4.04	943/1424	4.25	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.04	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	11	12	4.15	603/1396	4.42	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	11	9	3.85	920/1342	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	9	13	4.15	872/1459	4.30	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	12	15	4.56	1020/1480	4.53	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	7	10	7	3.88	989/1450	4.05	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	9	15	4.44	839/1409	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	400/1407	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	1	13	10	4.15	920/1399	4.26	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	9	13	4.19	921/1400	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	7	6	10	3.85	732/1179	4.12	3.94	3.96	4.02	3.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	4	4	16	4.36	477/1262	4.39	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	1	23	4.84	266/1259	4.78	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.84	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	1	21	4.64	477/1256	4.68	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	7	10	6	3.83	506/ 788	4.08	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.83	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	12	Under-grad	27	Non-major	1
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				?	1						
					4	Other	4				
					1						

Course-Section: WMST 322 0201
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: HAGOVSKY, ELIZA
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1482
 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	7	7	12	4.19	918/1481	3.99	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	17	4.54	481/1481	4.20	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1249	****	4.37	4.27	4.28	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	14	4.46	485/1424	4.25	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.46	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	5	20	4.69	169/1396	4.42	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	16	4.50	303/1342	4.18	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	8	15	4.46	520/1459	4.30	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	4.50	1044/1480	4.53	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	12	8	4.22	672/1450	4.05	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	16	4.52	739/1409	4.48	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.52	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1407	4.96	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	723/1399	4.26	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	4	7	14	4.40	704/1400	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	4	4	16	4.40	340/1179	4.12	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	1	3	15	4.43	418/1262	4.39	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	402/1259	4.78	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	0	2	18	4.71	406/1256	4.68	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	254/ 788	4.08	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	11	Under-grad	26	Non-major	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: WMST 338 0101
 Title WOMEN AND LAW
 Instructor: BEARSCH, LAURA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1483
 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	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	210/1481	4.83	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	434/1481	4.58	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	142/1249	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	209/1424	4.76	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	206/1342	4.65	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	3	13	4.42	580/1459	4.42	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	421/1480	4.95	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	459/1450	4.43	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	217/1409	4.69	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	300/1407	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	195/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	511/1400	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	352/1179	4.34	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 2	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: WMST 338 0101
 Title WOMEN AND LAW
 Instructor: KOERMER, KELLY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1484
 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	2	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	210/1481	4.83	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	5	13	4.58	434/1481	4.58	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	9	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	142/1249	4.90	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	209/1424	4.76	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	206/1342	4.65	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	1	3	13	4.42	580/1459	4.42	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	421/1480	4.95	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	417/1450	4.43	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	762/1409	4.69	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	1069/1407	4.75	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	431/1399	4.72	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.72	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1017/1400	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	13	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	419/1179	4.34	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.34	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	167/1262	4.80	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	296/1256	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	176/ 788	4.50	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 2	A 10	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	5
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		Under-grad 20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: WMST 352 0101
 Title GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO
 Instructor: BENVENGA, MICHE
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1485
 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	2	6	11	4.47	587/1481	4.47	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.47	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	361/1481	4.63	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	173/1424	4.81	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	252/1396	4.59	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.59	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	214/1342	4.63	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	107/1459	4.89	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	855/1480	4.79	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	389/1450	4.47	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	113/1409	4.94	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	145/1399	4.88	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	299/1400	4.76	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	372/1179	4.35	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.35	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	162/1262	4.82	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1259	4.91	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	216/1256	4.91	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	238/ 788	4.36	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.36	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 18	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	19
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		1
			? 0		
				Other	14

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: WMST 390F 0101
 Title QUEER REPRESENT FILM/T
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1486
 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	0	0	2	18	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	286/1481	4.70	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	228/1249	4.78	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	248/1424	4.71	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	82/1396	4.90	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	166/1342	4.70	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	16	4.62	332/1459	4.62	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	702/1480	4.90	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	188/1409	4.90	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	129/1399	4.90	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	146/1400	4.90	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	4.02	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	88/1262	4.94	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	294/1259	4.81	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	288/1256	4.81	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.81	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	8	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	358/ 788	4.13	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.13	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.23	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 10			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 12	Under-grad 21	Non-major 6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: WMST 695 0101
 Title RESEARCH SEMINAR WMST
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 1487
 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	0	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	961/1459	4.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.66	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.26	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	63/ 63	3.00	4.24	4.44	4.44	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	4.19	4.35	4.16	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	36/ 68	4.00	3.98	3.92	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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