Course-Section: LLC 600 0101 University of Maryland Baltimore County LANG, LIT, & CULTURE

Title Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN Fall 2007

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1021

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	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	11	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.82	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	382/1639	4.64	4.78	4.27	4.42	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	0	2		****/1397	****	4.76	4.22	4.20	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	143/1583	4.91	4.71	4.19	4.31	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	143/1503	4.82	4.63	4.19	4.10	4.82
3 3	•	0	0	0	0	∠ 1	10	4.82	111/1504	4.82	4.49	4.01	4.10	4.82
· ·	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.91	790/1612	4.91	4.85	4.16	4.29	4.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.74	4.16	4.27	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	134/1579	4.82	4.89	4.05		4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	U	U	U	U	U	2	9	4.82	134/15/9	4.82	4./3	4.08	4.17	4.82
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	510/1518	4.73	4.83	4.43	4.49	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	547/1517	4.55	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	591/1550	4.55	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	561/1295		3.91	3.94	3.95	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	285/1398	4.73	4.77	4.07	4.22	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.86	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.91	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	192/ 958	4.55	4.33	3.93	4.01	4.55
Seminar	_	_				_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.58	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	42/ 82	4.33	4.56	4.16	4.37	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	А	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: LLC 644 0101 University of Maryland Title METHODS OF LLC RESEARC

Baltimore County

Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10

FEB 13, 2008 Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029

Page 1022

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fr	eque:	ncie	3		Inst	tructor	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	2	8	4.80	257/1639	4.80	4.82	4.27	4.42	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.78	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1397	****	4.71	4.28	4.37	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.83	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	146/1532	4.80	4.49	4.01	4.10	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	118/1504	4.89	4.85	4.05	4.29	4.89
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.74	4.16	4.27	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.73	4.08	4.17	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	360/1518	4.80	4.83	4.43	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.96	4.70	4.79	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	371/1517	4.70	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	7	4.30	860/1550	4.30	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.30
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	8	4.50	265/1295	4.50	3.91	3.94	3.95	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	369/1398	4.60	4.77	4.07	4.22	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	543/1391	4.60	4.86	4.30	4.47	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	459/1388	4.70	4.91	4.28	4.49	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.33	3.93	4.01	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.58	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	42/ 82	4.33	4.56	4.16	4.37	4.33
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	3			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Red		ed f	or Ma			0	Graduat	 - 1	0	Majo		9

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	0	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: LLC 645 0101

Title QUANT RESEARCH MTHDS I

Instructor: OLIA, NEZHAT

Enrollment: 8
Questionnaires: 8

OLIA, NEZHAT Fall 2007

Page 1023 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		Questions	3		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	gain new	insights, ski	lls from	this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.82	4.27	4.42	4.25
2. Did the	instructo	or make clear	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	722/1639	4.38	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.38
		stions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	400/1397	4.63	4.71	4.28	4.37	4.63
4. Did othe	er evaluat	cions reflect	the exp	ected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	640/1583	4.38	4.83	4.19	4.31	4.38
				hat you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	469/1532	4.38	4.49	4.01	4.10	4.38
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	964/1504	3.88	4.85	4.05	4.29	3.88
		system clearly			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.74	4.16	4.27	5.00
		as class cance			0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00
-				ning effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	623/1579	4.29	4.73	4.08	4.17	4.29
		Lecture	e															
1. Were the	e instruct	or's lectures	s well r	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.83	4.43	4.49	4.75
		or seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	622/1520	4.88	4.96	4.70	4.79	4.88
				plained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	451/1517	4.63	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.63
		contribute to			0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	897/1550	4.25	4.42	4.22	4.23	4.25
				our understanding	0	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	768/1295	3.86	3.91		3.95	3.86
		Discus	sion															
1. Did clas	ss discus			hat you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	2	3.63	1059/1398	3.63	4.77	4.07	4.22	3.63
				l to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.86	4.30	4.47	4.75
		-	_	l open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.91	4.28	4.49	4.50
		nniques succes		Copon dibodbbion	0	4	0	0	2	1	1		610/ 958	3.75	4.33	3.93	4.01	
		Labora	torv															
1. Did the	lab incre		_	the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	129/ 224	4.00	4.00	4.10	4.43	4.00
			_	round information	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	148/ 240	4.00	4.00	4.11	3.96	4.00
_	_	_	_	or lab activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	179/ 219	4.00	4.00	4.44	4.23	4.00
	-	ructor provide			6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	158/ 215	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.72	4.00
		_		early specified	6	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.74	****
		Semina	r															
1. Were ass	signed to			announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****
				vidual attention	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****
				hat you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.52	***
		contribute			7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	ı									
Credits Ear	cned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	pe.			Majors	3
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0	A 4 B 2		Rec	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	е	3	Majo	or	4
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001		_				-	011001 9		-	2.011		-
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El-	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1	Means +	here =	re not	enous	ıh
oraa.	5	3.30 1.00	_	P 0		1110						-	respons				_	,
				I O		Otł	ner					6	T CDPOID					
				? 0		561						v						

Course-Section: LLC 750A 0101 University of Maryland LANGUAGE IN THE CITY

Baltimore County Fall 2007

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 3

5. Were criteria for grading made clear

Page 1024 FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

				F	req	uen	cies	;		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		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.82	4.27	4.42	5.00
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0		0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.67
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0		0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1397	4.50	4.71	4.28	4.37	4.50
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.83	4.19	4.31	5.00
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.49	4.01	4.10	5.00
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.05	4.29	5.00
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0		0	0	1	2	4.67	317/1612	4.67	4.74	4.16	4.27	4.67
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0		0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.73	4.08	4.17	5.00
	Lecture															
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.83	4.43	4.49	5.00
2.	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.79	5.00
3.	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0		0	0	1	2	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.82	4.27	4.32	4.67
4.	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.23	5.00
5.	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.91	3.94	3.95	5.00
	Discussion															
1.	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.77	4.07	4.22	5.00
2.	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0		0	0	1	2	4.67	489/1391	4.67	4.86	4.30	4.47	4.67
3.	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0		0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.91	4.28	4.49	5.00
4.	Were special techniques successful	0	0	0		0	0	1	2	4.67	155/ 958	4.67	4.33	3.93	4.01	4.67
	Seminar															
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0		0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.58	5.00
2.	Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0		0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.74	5.00
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0		0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.52	5.00
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0		0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.47	4.50	5.00
_		_	_	_		_	_	_	_							

Frequency Distribution

1 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/ 82 5.00 4.56 4.16 4.37 5.00

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

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1025

FEB 13, 2008

Course-Section: LLC 750E 0101 Title THEORIES OF FEMINISM Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 MCCANN, CAROLE Instructor:

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	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	Ο	Ο	0	0	Ω	Ο	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.82	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.78	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.71	4.28	4.37	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.83	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.49	4.01	4.10	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.05	4.29	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.74	4.16	4.27	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1497/1635	4.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.73	4.08	4.17	5.00
									_,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.83	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.82	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.23	5.00
Discussion														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.77	4.07	4.22	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1398	5.00		4.07		5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.86 4.91	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	Ţ	5.00	,				4.49	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	4.33	3.93	4.01	4.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	rib	utior	n									

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

Course-Section: LLC 750F 0101

Baltimore County Fall 2007

University of Maryland Page 1026 Title ADV READING CRIT THEOR FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: BICKEL, BEVERLY (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnair	Р

					Frequencies		3				Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
		Question	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.82	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.78	4.22	4.26	5.00
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.71	4.28	4.37	****
4. Did oth	ner evalı	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	402/1583	4.57	4.83	4.19	4.31	4.57
5. Did ass	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	125/1532	4.86	4.49	4.01	4.10	4.86
5. Did wri	ltten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.05	4.29	5.00
7. Was the	grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.74	4.16	4.27	4.80
3. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.73	4.08	4.17	5.00
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.83	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.82	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.23	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding					4	0	0	1	0	2	0		1067/1295		3.91	3.94	3.95	3.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.77	4.07	4.22	5.00
				ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391		4.86	4.30	4.47	4.86
				nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1388		4.91	4.28	4.49	5.00
		echniques succe		ia open alboabbien	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	349/ 958		4.33	3.93	4.01	4.25
		Semina:	r															
1. Were as	ssigned t			announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****
				dividual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82		5.00	4.52	4.74	****
				what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 78		5.00	4.47	4.52	***
	_	ons contribute		_	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80		5.00	4.47	4.50	***
		for grading made			6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 82		4.56	4.16	4.37	****
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Do:	asons	,			Ty	ne			Majors	
		Cuiii. GPA		Expected Grades						· 								, . – – – –
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	0	Graduat	е	4	Majo	or	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							5	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad. 4 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh	
				P 0					responses to be significar					_				
				I 0	Other						1							
			2 1															

Course-Section: LLC 750F 0101 University of Maryland
Title ADV READING CRIT THEOR Baltimore County

Title ADV READING CRIT THEOR Baltimore County Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PAT (Instr. B) Fall 2007

Enrollment: 7
Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1027

FEB 13, 2008

Job IRBR3029

			F	requ	uen	cies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	. 1	L :	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General															
. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	() (0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.82	4.27	4.42	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	() (0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.78	4.22	4.26	5.00
Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	() (0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	****	4.71	4.28	4.37	****
Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	() (0	0	3	4	4.57	402/1583	4.57	4.83	4.19	4.31	4.57
. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	() (0	0	1	6	4.86	125/1532	4.86	4.49	4.01	4.10	4.86
. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 0	0	() (0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.05	4.29	5.00
. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	() (0	0	1	4	4.80	166/1612	4.80	4.74	4.16	4.27	4.80
. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	() (0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00
. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 2	0	() (0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1579	5.00	4.73	4.08	4.17	5.00
Lecture															
. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	() (0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1518	5.00	4.83	4.43	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	() (0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.79	5.00
. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	() (0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.82	4.27	4.32	5.00
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	() (0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.42	4.22	4.23	5.00
. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin	g 3	1	() :	2	0	1	0	2.67	1229/1295	3.00	3.91	3.94	3.95	3.00
Discussion															
. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	() (0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.77	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	() (0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.86	4.30	4.47	4.86
. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussio	n 0	0	() (0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.91	4.28	4.49	5.00
. Were special techniques successful	0	3	() :	1	0	0	3	4.25	349/ 958	4.25	4.33	3.93	4.01	4.25
Seminar															
. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	() (0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	5.00	4.58	4.58	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attentio	n 6	0	() (0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.74	****
. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	() (0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	5.00	4.47	4.52	****
. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	() (0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.47	4.50	****
. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	() (0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.56	4.16	4.37	****
Fr	equency	y Di	stri	ibut	ion										
redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad	es			1	Rea	sons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		 R	 equi	ired	fo	r Ma	jors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	4	Majo	 or	7

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

Course-Section: LLC 890 0101 University of Maryland Title RES PROPOSAL SEMINAR FEB 13, 2008 Job IRBR3029

Page 1028

Baltimore County Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA (Instr. A) Fall 2007

Enrollment:	3
Questionnaires:	3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				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	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.82	4.27	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.83	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1330/1532	3.33	4.49	4.01	4.10	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.05	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	569/1579	4.33	4.73	4.08	4.17	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1021/1518	4.33	4.83	4.43	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.96	4.70	4.79	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.82	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	457/1550	3.33	4.42	4.22	4.23	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.77	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.86	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.91	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.33	3.93	4.01	4.50
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ıtioı	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: LLC 890 0101 University of Maryland Page 1029 RES PROPOSAL SEMINAR Baltimore County FEB 13, 2008

Title Fall 2007 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment:	3	
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies					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	0	0	1	2	4.67	430/1639	4.67	4.82	4.27	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.78	4.22	4.26	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.83	4.19	4.31	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1330/1532	3.33	4.49	4.01	4.10	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.85	4.05	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.89	4.65	4.81	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.77	4.07	4.22	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.86	4.30	4.47	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.91	4.28	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	201/ 958	4.50	4.33	3.93	4.01	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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