Course-Section: GWST 100 0101 University of Maryland INTRO GENDER & WOMEN

Title Baltimore County Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO Spring 2008

Enrollment: 31 Ouestionnaires: 17 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

P

I

0

0

						Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,skil	lls from t	his course	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	643/1670	4.53	4.45	4.31	4.23	4.53
		ctor make clear	_	-	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1125/1666	4.12	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.12
	_	uestions reflect	_	_	0	15	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.31	****
		ations reflect	_	_	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1018/1615	4.12	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.12
	_	eadings contribu		-	0	0	0	0	1	7	9		419/1566	4.47	4.41	4.07	4.03	4.47
		signments contri		-	0	0	0	3	2	5	7		983/1528	3.94	4.40	4.12	4.00	3.94
		g system clearly	-	d	0	0	1	1	3	4	8		1135/1650	4.00	4.37		4.28	4.00
		was class cance			0	0	0	2	9	6	0		1659/1667	3.24	4.39	4.67	4.61	
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overal	ll teachin	g effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	808/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.19
		Lecture	9															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	s well pre	pared	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1211/1559	4.18	4.31	4.46	4.47	4.18
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested in t	he subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	803/1560	4.82	4.91	4.72	4.68	4.82
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presented	d and expl	ained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	0	13	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.50
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	what you	learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	755/1546	4.47	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.47
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enh	nance your	understanding	0	2	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	849/1323	3.87	4.19	4.00	3.91	3.87
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribu	ite to wha	t you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	340/1384	4.64	4.64	4.10	3.92	4.64
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	couraged t	o participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.61	4.29	4.09	4.71
3. Did th	e instru	ctor encourage f	air and o	pen discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	550/1378	4.64	4.72	4.31	4.08	4.64
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succes	ssful		3	5	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.17	4.03	3.94	4.33
		Laborat	orv															
1. Did th	e lab ind	crease understar	-	he material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****
			_	und information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
_	_	materials avail	_		16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****		4.58	****
	_	structor provide			16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****		4.45	***
		nts for lab repo			16	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 218	****	***	4.18	4.47	***
				Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	;
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 10					or Ma	ior		8	Graduat		0	 Majo	 r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 5		1/6/	4u11C	-u 10)ı Ma	בטנ.	D	J	Graduati	_	J	Majc	, <u> </u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0		Ger	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	res				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	;h

Other

5

Page 906

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Course-Section: GWST 100H 0101 University of Maryland INTRO GENDER & WOMEN Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 907

Title Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO Spring 2008

Enrollment:	8	
Questionnaires:	5	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions		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	0	4	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.45	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect th	e expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.31	***
4. Did other evaluations reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.41	4.07	4.03	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribut	e to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	760/1528	4.20	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly ex	plained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelle	d	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1648/1667	3.50	4.39	4.67	4.61	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall t	eaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures we	ll prepared	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1532/1559	2.75	4.31	4.46	4.47	2.75
2. Did the instructor seem intereste	d in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented an	d explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to wh	at you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhanc	e your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1125/1323	3.25	4.19	4.00	3.91	3.25
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.64	4.10	3.92	4.60
2. Were all students actively encour	aged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair	and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.72	4.31	4.08	4.80
4. Were special techniques successfu	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.17	4.03	3.94	4.50
	Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 1 0 00-0 99 0	 Δ 5					 or Ma			າ	Graduat		 0	Maio	~~~~~	1

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: GWST 200 0101 University of Maryland Page 908 Title STUDIES IN FEM ACTIVIS Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Spring 2008 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 31

_			
Student	Courge	Fwaluation	Questionnaire
Deadcire	COULDC	n varaacron	Queberonnarie

							Fre	equei	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did	you gain ne	ew insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	1	1	5	8	16	4.19	1060/1670	4.19	4.45	4.31	4.32	4.19
2. Did	the instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	3	4	10	14	4.13	1114/1666	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.13
3. Did	the exam qu	uestions reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	23	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	2	1	0	4	8	16	4.31	800/1615	4.31	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.31
5. Did	assigned re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	6	19	4.29	599/1566	4.29	4.41	4.07	4.00	4.29
6. Did	written as:	signments contri	bute to	o what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	11	16	4.32	641/1528	4.32	4.40	4.12	4.11	4.32
7. Was	the grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	0	0	0	2	3	5	21	4.45	645/1650	4.45	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.45
8. How	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	10	21	4.68	1012/1667	4.68	4.39	4.67	4.64	4.68
9. How	would you	grade the overal	l teac	ning effectiveness	5	1	1	2	3	7	12	4.08	910/1626	4.08	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.08
		Lecture	2															
1. Were	e the instr	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	5	0	0	2	4	10	10	4.08	1263/1559	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	5	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	929/1560	4.77	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.77
3. Was	lecture mat	terial presented	l and e	xplained clearly	5	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	994/1549	4.23	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.23
4. Did	the lecture	es contribute to	what	you learned	5	0	1	0	3	8	14	4.31	949/1546	4.31	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.31
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	6	1	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	304/1323	4.54	4.19	4.00	4.08	4.54
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	3	16	4.38	570/1384	4.38	4.64	4.10	4.07	4.38
2. Were	e all stude	nts actively end	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	540/1378	4.58	4.61	4.29	4.25	4.58
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	627/1378	4.54	4.72	4.31	4.26	4.54
4. Were	e special to	echniques succes	ssful	_	7	7	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	526/ 904	3.94	4.17	4.03	4.01	3.94
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	
														- 				
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 17		Red	quire	ed fo	or M	ajor	s	3	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В 9		~		,				_	77		1	37		0.0
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C 0		Gei	nera:	T				5	Under-g	rad 3	1	Non-	-major	22
84-150		3.00-3.49	5	D 0								1			1			1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	nere a	re not	enoug	n

Other

17

responses to be significant

Course-Section: GWST 322 0101 University of Maryland Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA Baltimore County Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 909

AUG 6, 2008

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 23 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						eque					tructor	Course	_		Level	Sec
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
	General															
. Did you gain r	new insights, skills from this	course	0	0	2	1	4	4	12	4.00	1216/1670	4.14	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.
. Did the instru	actor make clear the expected	goals	0	0	0	3	9	4	7	3.65	1457/1666	3.85	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.
. Did the exam	questions reflect the expected	goals	0	19	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1406	4.29	4.54	4.32	4.22	* *
. Did other eval	luations reflect the expected	goals	0	1	1	2	2	9	8	3.95	1158/1615	4.13	4.46	4.24	4.18	3.
. Did assigned r	readings contribute to what yo	u learned	0	0	2	1	5	3	12	3.96	930/1566	4.20	4.41	4.07	4.04	3.
. Did written as	ssignments contribute to what	you learned	0	0	1	1	6	8	7	3.83	1105/1528	4.14	4.40	4.12	4.07	3.
. Was the gradin	ng system clearly explained		0	2	1	3	2	10	5	3.71	1382/1650	3.83	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.
. How many times	s was class cancelled		0	1	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	1002/1667	4.52	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.
. How would you	grade the overall teaching ef	fectiveness	5	1	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	1143/1626	4.08	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.
	Lecture															
. Were the instr	ructor's lectures well prepare	d	3	0	0	2	5	6	7	3.90	1352/1559	4.01	4.31	4.46	4.40	3.
Did the instru	actor seem interested in the s	ubject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	298/1560	4.84	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.
Was lecture ma	aterial presented and explaine	d clearly	3	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1146/1549	4.08	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.
Did the lectur	res contribute to what you lea	rned	2	2	2	1	3	5	8	3.84	1256/1546	3.95	4.58	4.32	4.24	3.
Did audiovisua	al techniques enhance your und	erstanding	2	1	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.19	4.00	3.99	4
	Discussion															
	cussions contribute to what yo		6	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	683/1384		4.64	4.10	4.12	4
	ents actively encouraged to pa		6	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	540/1378		4.61	4.29	4.30	4
	actor encourage fair and open	discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	492/1378		4.72	4.31	4.33	4
Were special t	cechniques successful		6	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	373/ 904	4.27	4.17	4.03	4.03	4
	Seminar															
_	topics relevant to the announ		22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, -	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	* :
	actor available for individual		22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	*:
_	projects contribute to what yo		22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75		5.00	4.57	4.50	* :
-	ions contribute to what you le	arned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 79		5.00	4.45	3.68	*
Were criteria	for grading made clear		22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	*
	Self Paced								•	4 00						
	d system contribute to what yo		22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	*:
	stions make clear the expected		22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	
	acts with the instructor help		22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	*:
	ack/tutoring by proctors helpf		22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.84	****	* *
were there end	ough proctors for all the stud	ents	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	* * * *	****	4.92	****	* 7
		Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned	Cum. GPA Expe	cted Grades				Re	ason	.s			Ту	pe			Majors	5
0-27 1	0.00-0.99 0	 A 5		Re	 quir	ed f	or M	 ajor	s	7	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	
8-55 3	1.00-1.99 0	в 14														
6-83 5	2.00-2.99 2	C 1		Ge	nera	1				8	Under-g	rad 2	13	Non-	-major	2
4-150 2	3.00-3.49 6	D 0														
rad. 0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
		P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
		I 0		Ot.	her					7						
		2 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: GWST 322 0201 WOMEN AND THE MEDIA Title Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
Enrollment: 34 Spring 2008

FILLOI I MEHC:	34		
Questionnaires:	18	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

				Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	cructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	. N	ΙA	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	9	4.28	974/1670	4.14	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0		0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	1167/1666	3.85	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	852/1406	4.29	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0		2	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	800/1615	4.13	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learne	ed 0		0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	450/1566	4.20	4.41	4.07	4.04	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you lear	ned 0		0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	504/1528	4.14	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0		0	0	2	5	3	8	3.94	1220/1650	3.83	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.94
8. How many times was class cancelled	1		0	0	1	0	8	8	4.35	1295/1667	4.52	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.35
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiven	ess 2		2	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	693/1626	4.08	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.29
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0		0	0	2	4	2	10	4.11	1249/1559	4.01	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0		0	0	0	2	1			1004/1560	4.84	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl			0	0	2	2	5	9		1053/1549	4.08	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0		0	0	3	3	2	10		1121/1546	3.95	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi	ng 0		0	0	1	3	0	14		326/1323	4.50	4.19	4.00		4.50
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learne	ed 5		0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	560/1384	4.31	4.64	4.10	4.12	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participat			0	1	0	1	2		4.38	740/1378	4.49	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussi			0	1	0	1	2		4.38	768/1378	4.55	4.72	4.31		4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	5		6	0	0	2	1	4		356/ 904		4.17	4.03	4.03	
F	'requenc	y D)ist:	ribu	ıtior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra	- Idea	_			Re:	sons	2			Ty	ne			Majors	
Barnea Cum. Gra Expected Gra							, 			ту.					,
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7			Req	uire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0

Page 910

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: GWST 338 0101 University of Maryland Page 911
Title WOMEN AND LAW Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: BEARSCH, LAURA (Instr. A)

3.50-4.00

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 20

Grad.

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equei	ncie	s		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did y	you gain n	ew insights, skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.00
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	719/1666	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.45
		uestions reflect			0	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.40
	_	uations reflect			0	1	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	737/1615	4.37	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.37
				what you learned	0	1	2	1	5	3	8	3.74	1159/1566	3.74	4.41	4.07	4.04	3.74
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	10	4.10	842/1528	4.10	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.10
		g system clearly		_	1	0	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	1079/1650	4.11	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.11
	_	was class cance	_		0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.20
	-			hing effectiveness	9	0	0	2	3	6	0	3.36	1452/1626	3.36	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.36
		Lecture	2															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	well	prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	689/1559	4.63	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.63
2. Did t	the instru	ctor seem intere	sted i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	725/1560	4.93	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was 1	lecture ma	terial presented	l and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	622/1549	4.68	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.68
4. Did t	the lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	715/1546	4.65	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.65
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	0	3	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	879/1323	3.82	4.19	4.00	3.99	3.82
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contribu	ite to	what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were	all stude	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	2	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage f	air an	d open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	580/1378	4.61	4.72	4.31	4.33	4.61
4. Were	special t	echniques succes	sful		2	2	2	3	3	2	6	3.44	748/ 904	3.44	4.17	4.03	4.03	3.44
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12				ed fo				1	 Graduat		0			
	-		-			ке	quir	eu I	יועו זע	ajor	ď	1	Graduat	E	U	Majo	JΙ	0
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 3 C 0				G = -	nera	1				1	IIndor -	A	0	Mon	mo -i o	20		
	3					Ge	nera.	T				4	Under-g	rau Z	U	MOI1-	-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

Other

1

9

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

0

0

0

0

Ρ

I

Course-Section: GWST 338 0101 University of Maryland Page 912 Title WOMEN AND LAW Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 20

Spring 2008
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncie	:S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions		NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			_		Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	719/1666	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	737/1615	4.37	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1 0	1	2	1	5	3	8	3.74	1159/1566	3.74	4.41	4.07	4.04	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ned 0	0	1	2	1	6	10	4.10	842/1528	4.10	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	1079/1650	4.11	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivened	ess 17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1626	3.36	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	772/1559	4.63	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.93	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7 15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.68	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1		4.80	345/1546	4.65	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	ng 15	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1323	3.82	4.19	4.00	3.99	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1 2	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	580/1378	4.61	4.72	4.31	4.33	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	3	3	2	6	3.44	748/ 904	3.44	4.17	4.03	4.03	3.44
F1	requency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad					ason				Ту	_			Majors	;
00-27 0 0 000-0 99 0 b 12											0	Majo		0

Credits E	arned	ned Cum. GPA			ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GWST 352 0101

Title GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO

Instructor: BENVENGA, MICHE

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2008

Page 913 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank		e Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	622/1666		4.37	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	0	1	0	5	4.14			4.54	4.32	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	592/1615		4.46	4.24	4.18	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50			4.41	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		1	0	0	1	5	15	4.67			4.40	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68			4.37	4.22	4.12	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21		,		4.39	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	4		4.73			4.29	4.11		4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	640/1559	4.68	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	596/1560		4.91	4.72	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73			4.59	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	,		4.58	4.32	4.24	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	674/1323	4.05	4.19	4.00	3.99	4.05
Discussion	0	0	0	•		•	1.1	4 05	000/1204	4 05	1 61	4 10	4 10	4 05
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	11		200/1384		4.64	4.10	4.12	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92			4.61	4.29	4.30	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	344/1378		4.72	4.31	4.33	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	300/ 904	4.38	4.17	4.03	4.03	4.38
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information	ı 21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4 . 21	3.99	****
					-	-	_		,					
Seminar			•			_	_							****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	,		5.00	4.65	4.30	***
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	, -		5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1 0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	, -		5.00	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19 19	0	0	0	0	0	3		****/ 80		5.00 5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	U	U	U	U	U	3	5.00	^^^^/ 80		5.00	3.97	3.76	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 41		****	4.50	4.44	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 28	****	***	4.64	3.33	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	/ 20			4.04	3.33	
Freq	quency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	5			Re	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 13		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	2	Graduat	.e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 3 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 3 C 1		Ge	nerai	1				8	Under-c	rad 2	22	Non-	major	22
84-150 6 3.00-3.49 6 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0		רים.	ecti	1700				0	#### -				-	h
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 6 F 0		ET.	ECLI	ves				U	#### - respons				_	11
I 0 Other								9						

1

Course-Section: GWST 352H 0101 University of Maryland GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO Baltimore County

? 0

Page 914 Title AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Instructor: BENVENGA, MICHE Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	5			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Ouestions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.41	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.40	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.67
		actor's lecture			0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.31	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.67	5.00
		-		xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.25	5.00
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.19	4.00	3.99	5.00
		Discus																
				what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1384	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.12	5.00
		-	_	d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1378	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.30	5.00
		_		d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1378	5.00	4.72	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.17	4.03	4.03	5.00
				Frequ	iency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pο	asons	,			Туј	20			Majors	4
	arnea 									- 				,e 				,
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduate	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	2
84-150 2 3.00-3.49 1 D 0																		
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0					Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - I					ſh	
	P 0												response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
I 0						Otl	Other 1											

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: GWST 480 0101 Title THEORIES OF FEMINISM Spring 2008 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE Enrollment: 7

Page 915 AUG 6, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Frequencies				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
		Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.75
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.41	4.07	4.17	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned							0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.40	4.12	4.26	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained							0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled							0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.39	4.67	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness							0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.50
		Lecture	e															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.31	4.46	4.58	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	2	2	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.50
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.43	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1193/1378	3.50	4.61	4.29	4.55	3.50
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.72	4.31	4.60	4.75
		Semina	r															
1. Were a	ssigned t	topics relevant	to the	e announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	crib	ıtioı	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades								Do.	asons	,			Ty	ne			Majors	
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades									asom	- :				 he			ма JOIS 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Required for Majors					0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1														

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

Course-Section: GWST 495 0101 University of Maryland Title

Baltimore County COLLOQUIUM: RES & ACTV MCCANN, CAROLE

Instructor: Enrollment: 6

Questionnaires: 5

Spring 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 916

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	_	^	0	^	_	F 00	1 /1 670	г оо	4 45	4 21	4 4 5	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00			4.45	4.31	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	•	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.48	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.37	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.41	4.07	4.17	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.40	4.12	4.26	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.28	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667		4.39	4.67	4.73	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.28	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	Ο	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.31	4.46	4.58	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1546		4.58	4.32	4.43	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	0		****/1323			4.00	4.10	****
J. Did addivibual techniques childree your understanding	_	3	O	U	_	O	U	3.00	/1323		1.10	1.00	1.10	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.55	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.72	4.31	4.60	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.17	4.03	4.22	****
Seminar	_		_		_		_		4 / 05				4 00	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.56	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.53	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	3.97	3.67	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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