Course-Section: LLC 635 0101 University of Maryland Title SOC CULT LRNG THEOR

Questionnaires: 6

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 943

JUN 26, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER Spring 2007 Enrollment: 6

> Ρ Ι

?

0

		Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank			Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 Did wo	u gain ng	Genera w insights,ski		om this sourse	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.80	246/152	22 /	80	4.94	4.30	4.45	4.80
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	935/152		20	4.84	4.26	4.29	4.20
		ations reflect			1	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	792/147		25	4.82	4.22	4.31	4.25
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/141		80	4.81	4.06	4.25	4.80
	_	_		to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	2		1016/138		80	4.73	4.08	4.25	3.80
		g system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	3	0	2		1147/150		80	4.78	4.18	4.22	3.80
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	4	1		1301/151		20	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.20
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	385/149	97 4.	50	4.68	4.11	4.21	4.50
		Lectur	e																
1. Were th	he instru	actor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1186/144	10 4.	00	4.74	4.45	4.48	4.00
		ctor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/144	18 5.	00	4.90	4.71	4.80	5.00
				explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/143		25	4.82	4.29	4.37	4.25
		es contribute t			2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	884/143		25	4.76	4.29	4.33	4.25
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	s enhance your understanding 1 2 2 1 0 0 0 1.33 1215/1221					21 1.	33	3.70	3.93	3.83	1.33						
	Discussion																		
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	718/128		00	4.71	4.10	4.24	4.00
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/127		60	4.84	4.34	4.52	4.60
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/126		00	4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		1	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	779/ 85	54 3.	00	4.50	4.02	4.08	3.00
		Semina																	
				e announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,		**	5.00	4.58	4.76	****
				dividual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		,	,	**	4.90	4.52	4.70	****
				what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00		, ,	* *	4.95	4.49	4.71	****
_		ons contribute for grading mad		-	5 5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	U	**	4.90 4.95	$4.45 \\ 4.11$	4.66	****
J. WEIE C	riceria i	tor grading mad	e crear		_	-	Ü	Ü	Ü	U	1	3.00	/	, 0		1.75	7.11	1.50	
				Frequ	lency	Dis	trib	ıtior	ı										
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	3			5	Туре				Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors		0	Gradua	te		 4	Majo	r	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2	•														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							1	Under-	grad	2	2	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0															
Grad.						Ele	ectiv	res				0						enoug	jh
				Р 0									respon	ises t	o be	e sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

3

Course-Section: LLC 750A 0101

LANG, RACE, & ETHNICIT

Title

Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2007

Page 944 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.94	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1522	4.86	4.84	4.26	4.29	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	****	4.30	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	151/1476		4.82	4.22	4.31	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7		1/1412		4.81	4.06	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86		4.86	4.73	4.08	4.25	4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	- ,		4.78	4.18	4.22	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1517		4.75		4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.68	4.11	4.21	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.74	4.45	4.48	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.90	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.82	4.29	4.37	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.76	4.29	4.33	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	175/1221				3.83	4.67
									-,					
Discussion		•	0	0	-	2	2	4 00	566/1000	4 00	4 51	4 10	4 0 4	4 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	566/1280		4.71	4.10	4.24	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1277		4.84	4.34	4.52	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	0		4.29	756/1269		4.88	4.31	4.51	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	4.50	4.02	4.08	4.40
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.72	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.39	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.61	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.76	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.40	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	2	3		53/ 77	4.60	4.90	4.52	4.70	4.60
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4		30/ 65		4.95	4.49	4.71	4.80
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	46/ 78	4.60	4.90	4.45	4.66	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 80	4.80	4.95	4.11	4.38	4.80
	_		•	-	-	_	_							
Field Work	_	_	_	_										
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.90	4.41	4.40	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.80	4.30	4.49	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.78	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	1		14/ 35	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.71	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.75	4.30	4.82	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.63	4.82	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.68	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.79	****
-														

Course-Section: LLC 750A 0101

Title LANG, RACE, & ETHNICIT

Instructor:

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 7

MALLINSON, CHRI

Spring 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Frequency Distribution

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	3	Major	0
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	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Page 944

JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029 Course-Section: LLC 750B 0101 University of Maryland Title CULT & DESIGN OF ICTS

Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2

Spring 2007

Page 945 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie:	s 4	5	Instr Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522		4.94	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522		4.84	4.26	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.82	4.22	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.81	4.06	4.25	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.73	4.08	4.25	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.68	4.11	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00		4.45	4.48	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.90	4.71	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.29	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432		4.76	4.29	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.70	3.93	3.83	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.71	4.10	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.84	4.34	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.50	4.02	4.08	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.90	4.52	4.70	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.95	4.49	4.71	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.90	4.45	4.66	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.95	4.11	4.38	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.63	4.82	5.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.68	5.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.83	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 18	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.92	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

 Course-Section:
 LLC
 750B 0101
 University of Maryland
 Page 946

 Title
 CULT & DESIGN OF ICTS
 Baltimore County
 JUN 26, 2007

 Instructor:
 (Instr. B)
 Spring 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I 0

							Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did vou	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.94	4.30	4.45	5.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522		4.84	4.26	4.29	5.00
		ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476		4.82	4.22	4.31	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412		4.81	4.06	4.25	5.00
	_	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381		4.73	4.08	4.25	5.00
		system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500		4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517		4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.68	4.11	4.21	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.71	4.10	4.24	5.00
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277		4.84	4.34	4.52	5.00
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269		4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00
		echniques succe		a open arboabbien	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 854			4.02		5.00
		10000			_	_	-	-	-	-	_		_, _,					
		Semina	_															
	1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme					0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 79		5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00
				lividual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77		4.90	4.52	4.70	5.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65		4.95	4.49	4.71	5.00
		ons contribute			1	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 78		4.90	4.45	4.66	5.00
5. Were cr	riteria f	for grading made	e clear		1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.95	4.11	4.38	5.00
		Self	Paced															
1. Did sel	Lf-paced			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.63	4.82	5.00
		ions make clea			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 23		5.00	4.41	4.68	5.00
		acts with the in			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00
		k/tutoring by			0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.83	5.00
		igh proctors for	_	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 18	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.92	5.00
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	ution	1									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Rec	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	0	Graduat	e	2	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1 Under-grad 0 Non-mag					major	1							
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0														
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ŗh
				P 0									respons	es to b	oe sign	ifican	ıt	

Other

1

Course-Section: LLC 750C 0101 Title

ADV QUALITATIVE RESEAR

MALLINSON, CHRI Instructor:

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2007

Page 947 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	O O O 1 1 1 1 1	NA 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0	2 0 0 0	3 0 0	1	5 5	Mean 	Rank 	Mean 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0 0 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0	0	•	1	5	4.83	225/1522	1 02				
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0 0 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0	0	•	1	5	4.83	225/1522	1 02				
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0 0 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0	0	•	_					4.94	4.30	4.45	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1 1 1	0 0	0		0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.84	4.26	4.29	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1 1 1	0	0		0	1	5	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.82	4.22	4.31	4.83
	1 1 1	0	-	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.81	4.06	4.25	4.80
h uld written agglanments contribute to what vou learned	1	-	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.73	4.08	4.25	5.00
-	1		0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1501	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	_	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.80
•	0	0	0	0	0	2	4		264/1497		4.68	4.11	4.21	
- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•	-	-	-	-	_	_							
Lecture														
	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.74	4.45	4.48	4.83
_,	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.90	4.71	4.80	5.00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.29	4.37	5.00
	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding (0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.70	3.93	3.83	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned (0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.71	4.10	4.24	5.00
-	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.84	4.34	4.52	5.00
1 2 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00
-	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	166/ 854	4.60	4.50	4.02	4.08	4.60
Seminar														
	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	,	****	5.00	4.58	4.76	****
	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 77	****	4.90	4.52	4.70	****
	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 65	****	4.95	4.49	4.71	****
	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78	****	4.90	4.45	4.66	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.95	4.11	4.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 47	4.80	4.90	4.41	4.40	4.80
-	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	19/ 45	4.60	4.80	4.30	4.49	4.60
	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.78	5.00
	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.71	5.00
·	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	14/ 34	4.75	4.75	4.30	4.82	4.75
Frequenc		.	د ما امد											

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 890 0101 University of Maryland RES PROPOSAL SEMINAR

Baltimore County Spring 2007

Title Instructor: MALONEY-KRICHMA

Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 4

Page 948 JUN 26, 2007 Job IRBR3029

res:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

	- -			Inst	cructor	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	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.94	4.30	4.45	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.84	4.26	4.29	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.82	4.22	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.81	4.06	4.25	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.75	4.73	4.08	4.25	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.68	4.11	4.21	4.67
<u> </u>														
Lecture	_	0	^	0	^	^	0	F 00	1 /1 4 4 0	F 00	4 74	4 45	4 40	F 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1		5.00	1/1440 1157/1448	5.00 4.50	4.74	4.45 4.71	4.48	5.00 4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2 2	0	0	0	0	0	1 2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.71	4.80	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1430	5.00	4.02	4.29	4.37	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	0	1		1064/1221	3.00	3.70	3.93	3.83	3.00
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	Т	U	1	U	Τ	U	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.70	3.93	3.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.71	4.10	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.84	4.34	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.50	4.02	4.08	5.00
Seminar	_	0	^	0	^	^	0	F 00	1 / 70	F 00	г оо	4 50	4 76	F 00
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.90	4.52	4.70	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.95	4.49	4.71	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.90	4.45	4.66	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	U	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.95	4.11	4.38	5.00
Frequ	ency.	Dist	rib	ution	n									

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