

Course-Section: LLC 635 0101
 Title SOC CULT LRNG THEOR
 Instructor: SEILER, GALE
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 934
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	292/1481	4.75	4.71	4.29	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	228/1481	4.75	4.66	4.23	4.11	4.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	437/1424	4.50	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.76	3.98	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.69	4.07	4.18	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1154/1459	3.75	3.85	4.16	4.01	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1480	4.75	4.78	4.68	4.74	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	630/1450	4.25	4.34	4.09	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	559/1409	4.67	4.81	4.42	4.36	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1407	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.36	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	791/1400	4.33	4.73	4.27	4.17	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	4.60	3.96	3.81	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.67	4.05	4.07	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.79	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.92	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.44	4.00	3.97	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 640 0101
 Title SOC, CULTURE & DIVERSI
 Instructor: TEMPLE, CHRISTE
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 935
 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	2	4.67	395/1481	4.67	4.71	4.29	4.28	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	736/1481	4.33	4.66	4.23	4.11	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.76	3.98	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.69	4.07	4.18	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1201/1459	3.67	3.85	4.16	4.01	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1044/1480	4.50	4.78	4.68	4.74	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.34	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.81	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.36	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	590/1179	4.00	4.60	3.96	3.81	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1262	4.67	4.67	4.05	4.07	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	451/1259	4.67	4.79	4.29	4.30	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1256	4.67	4.92	4.30	4.33	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 788	5.00	4.44	4.00	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LLC 641 0101
 Title COMMUNITY & LITERACY C
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 936
 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	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1481	4.43	4.71	4.29	4.28	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	434/1481	4.57	4.66	4.23	4.11	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.92	4.27	4.24	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	157/1424	4.86	4.67	4.21	4.16	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	96/1396	4.86	4.76	3.98	4.00	4.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	99/1342	4.86	4.69	4.07	4.18	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	961/1459	4.00	3.85	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	770/1480	4.86	4.78	4.68	4.74	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.34	4.09	3.96	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	682/1409	4.57	4.81	4.42	4.36	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	659/1399	4.43	4.36	4.26	4.16	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	521/1400	4.57	4.73	4.27	4.17	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	152/1179	4.71	4.60	3.96	3.81	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.67	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.79	4.29	4.30	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.92	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	209/ 788	4.43	4.44	4.00	3.97	4.43	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 647 0101
 Title ONLINE VOICE & COMMUNI
 Instructor: CARPENTER, KARE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 937
 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	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.71	4.29	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.66	4.23	4.11	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.92	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.67	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.76	3.98	4.00	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.69	4.07	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	961/1459	4.00	3.85	4.16	4.01	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.78	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.34	4.09	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.81	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1407	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.36	4.26	4.16	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.73	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	4.60	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.67	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	588/1259	4.50	4.79	4.29	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.92	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.44	4.00	3.97	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.53	4.46	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.44	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 69	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.16	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	5.00	3.92	3.71	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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