

Course-Section: GWST 100 0101  
 Title INTRO GENDER & WOMEN  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 938  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	6	15	4.30	922/1649	4.41	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	14	4.41	702/1648	4.59	4.14	4.23	4.16	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	25	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1375	****	4.21	4.27	4.10	****		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	1	3	8	11	4.13	983/1595	4.40	4.15	4.20	4.03	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	18	4.41	476/1533	4.44	4.46	4.04	3.87	4.41	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	6	15	4.33	595/1512	4.53	4.21	4.10	3.86	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	6	5	11	3.70	1299/1623	4.00	3.95	4.16	4.08	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	21	1	3.88	1607/1646	3.98	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	5	13	4	3.95	987/1621	4.28	4.03	4.06	3.96	3.95	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	7	8	9	4.08	1243/1568	4.41	4.38	4.43	4.39	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	532/1572	4.96	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	11	9	4.21	992/1564	4.51	4.31	4.28	4.20	4.21	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	763/1559	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.20	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	2	4	3	6	3.53	1039/1352	3.76	3.82	3.98	3.86	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	582/1384	4.40	4.33	4.08	3.86	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	716/1382	4.46	4.38	4.29	4.03	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	3	2	1	18	4.28	827/1368	4.44	4.45	4.30	4.01	4.28	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	7	2	3	5	2	6	3.39	754/ 948	3.67	3.22	3.95	3.75	3.39	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	24	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	2	A	13	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	27	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GWST 100 0201  
 Title INTRO GENDER & WOMEN  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 939  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	4	5	18	4.52	630/1649	4.41	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	244/1648	4.59	4.14	4.23	4.16	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	25	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.21	4.27	4.10	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	321/1595	4.40	4.15	4.20	4.03	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	18	4.48	388/1533	4.44	4.46	4.04	3.87	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	209/1512	4.53	4.21	4.10	3.86	4.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	5	16	4.30	768/1623	4.00	3.95	4.16	4.08	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	23	3	4.07	1517/1646	3.98	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.07	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	288/1621	4.28	4.03	4.06	3.96	4.61	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	517/1568	4.41	4.38	4.43	4.39	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1572	4.96	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	263/1564	4.51	4.31	4.28	4.20	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	318/1559	4.63	4.32	4.29	4.20	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	1	3	6	8	4.00	690/1352	3.76	3.82	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	17	4.44	499/1384	4.40	4.33	4.08	3.86	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	600/1382	4.46	4.38	4.29	4.03	4.52	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	579/1368	4.44	4.45	4.30	4.01	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	5	9	6	3.95	482/ 948	3.67	3.22	3.95	3.75	3.95	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	****	****	4.29	4.14	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 10	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7					
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 1	General	8	Under-grad	26	Non-major 27
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0					
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	7			
				? 0					

Course-Section: GWST 210 0101  
 Title LESBIAN AND GAY STUDIE  
 Instructor: KENDALL, LAURIE  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 940  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	2	4	20	4.69	395/1649	4.69	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	2	21	4.65	375/1648	4.65	4.14	4.23	4.25	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	16	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	166/1375	4.90	4.21	4.27	4.37	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	362/1595	4.63	4.15	4.20	4.22	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	151/1533	4.81	4.46	4.04	4.04	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	4	21	4.77	186/1512	4.77	4.21	4.10	4.14	4.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	169/1623	4.81	3.95	4.16	4.21	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	25	1	4.04	1532/1646	4.04	4.21	4.69	4.63	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	296/1621	4.59	4.03	4.06	4.01	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	461/1568	4.77	4.38	4.43	4.39	4.77	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	225/1564	4.84	4.31	4.28	4.27	4.84	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	82/1559	4.96	4.32	4.29	4.33	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	167/1352	4.73	3.82	3.98	4.07	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	0	0	3	16	4.48	468/1384	4.48	4.33	4.08	3.99	4.48	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.38	4.29	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.21	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	3	2	3	1	5	3.21	808/ 948	3.21	3.22	3.95	3.89	3.21	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	****	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 88	****	****	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.47	3.33	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	****	4.43	3.67	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	****	4.35	5.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.93	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.09	4.05	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.47	4.49	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.38	3.66	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.30	4.07	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 3
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B 4	Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	Major 26
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Non-major 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	
				P 0	

General 11

Electives 2

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	7
?	0		

Course-Section: GWST 300 0101  
 Title: METHODOLOGIES OF GWST  
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 941  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	4	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.14	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	1	0	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.21	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	983/1595	4.13	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	272/1533	4.63	4.46	4.04	4.05	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	553/1512	4.38	4.21	4.10	4.11	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.33	3.95	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.21	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	687/1621	3.96	4.03	4.06	4.02	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	442/1568	4.89	4.38	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	728/1564	4.51	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	640/1559	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.23	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1002/1352	3.68	3.82	3.98	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	755/1384	4.11	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	860/1368	4.22	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	905/ 948	2.60	3.22	3.95	4.00	2.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GWST 300 0101  
 Title METHODOLOGIES OF GWST  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 942  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	4	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.14	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1375	****	4.21	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	983/1595	4.13	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	272/1533	4.63	4.46	4.04	4.05	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	553/1512	4.38	4.21	4.10	4.11	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	720/1623	4.33	3.95	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.21	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	3	6	0	3.67	1261/1621	3.96	4.03	4.06	4.02	3.96	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1568	4.89	4.38	4.43	4.39	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	580/1564	4.51	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.51	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1121/1559	4.28	4.32	4.29	4.23	4.28	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	914/1352	3.68	3.82	3.98	3.97	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	755/1384	4.11	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.38	4.29	4.37	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	860/1368	4.22	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	1	1	2	1	0	2.60	905/ 948	2.60	3.22	3.95	4.00	2.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: GWST 320 0101  
 Title INTRNATL WOMEN DIRECTO  
 Instructor: HOUSEHOLDER, AP  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 943  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	3	10	4.64	459/1649	4.64	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.14	4.23	4.18	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	258/1375	4.79	4.21	4.27	4.22	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	272/1595	4.71	4.15	4.20	4.21	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.46	4.04	4.05	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	171/1512	4.79	4.21	4.10	4.11	4.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	608/1623	4.43	3.95	4.16	4.08	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	531/1646	4.93	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	559/1621	4.36	4.03	4.06	4.02	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.93	4.38	4.43	4.39	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	473/1572	4.93	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	347/1559	4.79	4.32	4.29	4.23	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	120/1352	4.85	3.82	3.98	3.97	4.85	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	219/1384	4.79	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.79	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	194/1382	4.93	4.38	4.29	4.37	4.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	211/1368	4.93	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.93	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	546/ 948	3.88	3.22	3.95	4.00	3.88	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	****	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GWST 322 0101  
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, RACHE  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 944  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	5	1	7	4	5	3.14	1587/1649	3.12	4.34	4.28	4.27	3.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	10	1	4	5	2	2.45	1636/1648	2.48	4.14	4.23	4.18	2.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1328/1375	2.88	4.21	4.27	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	8	0	2	5	4	2.84	1561/1595	2.76	4.15	4.20	4.21	2.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	4	6	4	7	3.55	1221/1533	3.52	4.46	4.04	4.05	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	4	7	1	6	3.05	1423/1512	3.05	4.21	4.10	4.11	3.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	4	8	3	6	1	0	2.00	1615/1623	1.79	3.95	4.16	4.08	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	9	10	2	3.59	1628/1646	3.32	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.59	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	6	2	7	2	1	2.44	1593/1621	2.37	4.03	4.06	4.02	2.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	5	2	5	4	3.00	1515/1568	2.91	4.38	4.43	4.39	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	1	2	2	14	4.35	1352/1572	4.27	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	6	3	4	4	3.00	1496/1564	2.97	4.31	4.28	4.25	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	4	5	2	4	5	3.05	1473/1559	2.84	4.32	4.29	4.23	3.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	8	7	4.00	690/1352	4.03	3.82	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	937/1384	3.90	4.33	4.08	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	2	0	3	5	4.10	923/1382	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.37	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	2	5	4.00	948/1368	4.33	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	831/ 948	2.81	3.22	3.95	4.00	3.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 7	Under-grad 22 Non-major 22
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 3		



Course-Section: GWST 322 0201  
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA  
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, RACHE  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 945  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	3	7	7	0	3.11	1591/1649	3.12	4.34	4.28	4.27	3.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	11	1	0	2.50	1633/1648	2.48	4.14	4.23	4.18	2.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	2	2	5	3	0	2.75	1354/1375	2.88	4.21	4.27	4.22	2.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	4	1	8	2	1	2.69	1575/1595	2.76	4.15	4.20	4.21	2.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	5	6	3.50	1249/1533	3.52	4.46	4.04	4.05	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	5	3	4	3	3.06	1422/1512	3.05	4.21	4.10	4.11	3.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	6	7	3	2	0	0	1.58	1620/1623	1.79	3.95	4.16	4.08	1.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	13	3	0	3.06	1643/1646	3.32	4.21	4.69	4.67	3.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	4	4	4	2	0	2.29	1606/1621	2.37	4.03	4.06	4.02	2.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	1	6	4	1	2.81	1545/1568	2.91	4.38	4.43	4.39	2.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	4	2	9	4.19	1422/1572	4.27	4.85	4.70	4.64	4.19
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	4	1	3	8	0	2.94	1512/1564	2.97	4.31	4.28	4.25	2.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	5	2	4	4	1	2.63	1523/1559	2.84	4.32	4.29	4.23	2.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	655/1352	4.03	3.82	3.98	3.97	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	795/1384	3.90	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	483/1382	4.38	4.38	4.29	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	522/1368	4.33	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	2	3	1	1	1	2.50	917/ 948	2.81	3.22	3.95	4.00	2.50
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	****	3.99	4.05	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	11						

Course-Section: GWST 378 0101  
 Title WOMEN,GENDER AND SCIEN  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 946  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	1	11	4.62	497/1649	4.62	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.62	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	427/1648	4.62	4.14	4.23	4.18	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.21	4.27	4.22	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.15	4.20	4.21	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	217/1533	4.69	4.46	4.04	4.05	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	2	8	4.08	849/1512	4.08	4.21	4.10	4.11	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	284/1623	4.69	3.95	4.16	4.08	4.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	1004/1646	4.69	4.21	4.69	4.67	4.69	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1621	4.78	4.03	4.06	4.02	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	1137/1568	4.23	4.38	4.43	4.39	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	620/1564	4.54	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	662/1559	4.54	4.32	4.29	4.23	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	208/1352	4.67	3.82	3.98	3.97	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	180/1384	4.85	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	383/1382	4.77	4.38	4.29	4.37	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	631/1368	4.54	4.45	4.30	4.39	4.54	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	9	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	3.22	3.95	4.00	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	****	4.12	3.89	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	****	4.40	4.21	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	5	Under-grad	13	Non-major	9
84-150	2	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	3				
			? 0						

Course-Section: GWST 480 0101  
 Title THEORIES OF FEMINISM  
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 947  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	2	11	4.85	238/1649	4.85	4.34	4.28	4.50	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	729/1648	4.38	4.14	4.23	4.36	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.21	4.27	4.48	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.15	4.20	4.36	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	95/1533	4.92	4.46	4.04	4.14	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	194/1512	4.75	4.21	4.10	4.26	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	9	4.31	757/1623	4.31	3.95	4.16	4.27	4.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.21	4.69	4.71	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	511/1621	4.40	4.03	4.06	4.24	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	330/1568	4.85	4.38	4.43	4.54	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	473/1572	4.92	4.85	4.70	4.79	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	960/1564	4.23	4.31	4.28	4.40	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	475/1559	4.69	4.32	4.29	4.41	4.69	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1352	****	3.82	3.98	4.07	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.33	4.08	4.35	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.38	4.29	4.56	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.45	4.30	4.58	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	399/ 948	4.13	3.22	3.95	4.31	4.13	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 13 Non-major 10
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 4	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	Other 11	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GWST 680 0101  
 Title THEORIES OF FEMINISM  
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2008

Page 948  
 FEB 11, 2009  
 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	0	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.14	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.21	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.15	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.46	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	883/1512	4.00	4.21	4.10	4.35	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1623	5.00	3.95	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.00	4.21	4.69	4.81	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.03	4.06	4.20	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.85	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.32	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1351/1352	1.00	3.82	3.98	4.10	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.33	4.08	4.30	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1316/1382	3.00	4.38	4.29	4.52	3.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.45	4.30	4.56	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	936/ 948	2.00	3.22	3.95	4.03	2.00	

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		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 0
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	0
			? 0		