Course-Section: LLC 600A 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRODUCTION TO LLC Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1041

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	13			
Questionnaires:	13	Student Cour	se Evaluation	Questionnaire

Grad.

7

3.50-4.00 3

F 0

Ρ 0

?

I 0

							-										
				Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sec				
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mea
		General															
1. Did yo	u qain ne	ew insights, skills	from this course	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	830/1649	4.36	4.67	4.28	4.46	4.3
		ctor make clear the		2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	756/1648	4.36	4.60	4.23	4.34	4.3
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflect th	ne expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	***	4.75	4.27	4.44	***
l. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect the	e expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.58	4.20	4.35	4.2
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribute	to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	754/1533	4.09	4.50	4.04	4.28	4.0
. Did wr	itten as:	signments contribu	te to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.88	4.10	4.35	4.3
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly e	xplained	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	894/1623	4.18	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.1
3. How man	ny times	was class cancell	ed	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	664/1646	4.90	4.86	4.69	4.81	4.9
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.5
		Lecture															
L. Were tl	he instr	uctor's lectures w	ell prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.5
		ed in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572		4.88	4.70	4.83	5.	
			nd explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	812/1564	4.38	4.47	4.28	4.41	4.
		hat you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.48	4.29	4.41	4.0	
. Did aud	ce your understanding	5	3	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1270/1352	2.80	4.08	3.98	4.10	2.8		
		Discussion	n														
L. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contribute	to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	749/1384	4.13	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.1
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively encou	raged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	521/1382	4.63	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.0
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage fai:	r and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.70	4.30	4.56	4.5
l. Were sp	pecial to	echniques successf	ul	5	2	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	4.16	3.95	4.03	3.0
		Seminar															
. Were as	ssigned t	topics relevant to	the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.63	5.0
. Was the	e instru	ctor available for	individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	31/ 85	4.75	4.88	4.47	4.50	4.
. Did res	search p	rojects contribute	to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.43	5.
. Did pre	esentatio	ons contribute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 92	4.75	4.88	4.35	4.42	4.
. Were c	riteria :	for grading made c	lear	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/ 288	4.75	4.88	3.68	3.87	4.
			Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				R≏	ason	3			Ty	ne			Majors	2
													- 				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 2	A 10		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	S	0	Graduat	e	7	Majo	r	Š
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	В 0				_					_	_				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0		Ge:	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	6	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0														

Electives

Other

0

10

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1042 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI

Enrollment: 11
Ouestionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 433/1649 4.67 4.28 4.46 4.67 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 161/1648 4.89 4.60 4.23 4.34 4.89 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 7 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 \*\*\*\*/1375 \*\*\*\* 4.75 4.27 4.44 \*\*\*\* 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 321/1595 4.67 4.58 4.20 4.35 4.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 4 4 4.50 366/1533 4.50 4.50 4.04 4.28 4.50 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 123/1512 4.88 4.88 4.10 4.35 4.88 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 135/1623 4.88 4.59 4.16 4.29 4.88 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 3 5 4.63 1081/1646 4.63 4.86 4.69 4.81 4.63 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 288/1621 4.60 4.40 4.06 4.20 4.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89 273/1568 4.89 4.56 4.43 4.52 4.89 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.88 4.70 4.83 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 3 6 4.67 473/1564 4.67 4.47 4.28 4.41 4.67 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 2 2 5 4.33 901/1559 4.33 4.48 4.29 4.41 4.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 3 2 4 4.11 624/1352 4.11 4.08 3.98 4.10 4.11 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 4 4.33 613/1384 4.33 4.54 4.08 4.30 4.33 7 4.67 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 1 483/1382 4.67 4.73 4.29 4.52 4.67 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 1 8 4.89285/1368 4.89 4.70 4.30 4.56 4.89 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 1 0 0 1 7 4.44 249/948 4.44 4.16 3.95 4.03 4.44 Seminar 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 88 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.54 4.63 \*\*\*\* 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 8 0 0 0 0 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 85 \*\*\*\* 4.88 4.47 4.50 \*\*\*\* 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 81 \*\*\*\* 5.00 4.43 4.43 \*\*\*\* 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 8 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 \*\*\*\*/ 92 \*\*\*\* 4.88 4.35 4.42 \*\*\*\* 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 \*\*\*\*/ 288 \*\*\*\* 4.88 3.68 3.87 \*\*\*\*

## Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 645 0101 University of Maryland Title QUANT RESEARCH MTHDS I

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1043

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

GALINDO, CLAUDI

Instructor:

					Frequencies			Inst	tructor	Course Dept		t UMBC Level		Sect				
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Die	d vou gain r	new insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.67	4.28	4.46	4.50
		actor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	1		1347/1648	3.75	4.60	4.23		3.75
		questions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.75	4.27	4.44	4.50
		luations reflect			0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.58	4.20	4.35	4.50
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	624/1533	4.25	4.50	4.04	4.28	4.25
6. Die	d written as	ssignments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was	s the gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	815/1623	4.25	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.25
8. Ho	w many times	s was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. Ho	w would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	4.40	4.06	4.20	3.33
		Lectur																
1 Wa-	re the insti	ructor's lecture		nrenared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.50
		actor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.83	5.00
					0	0	0	0	2	1	1		1297/1564	3.75	4.47	4.28	4.41	3.75
	. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly . Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	2	0	2		1121/1559	4.00	4.48	4.29	4.41	
				our understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	2		1049/1352		4.08	3.98		3.50
J. 21	u uuu10712u	ar occimination on	idiioc 7	our under bounding	Ū	ŭ	_	Ü	_	Ū	_	3.30	1017, 1302	3.30	1.00	3.70	1.10	3.30
		Discus	sion															
1. Die	d class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.67
2. We:	re all stude	ents actively en	courage	d to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Di	d the instru	actor encourage	fair an	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.70	4.30	4.56	4.33
4. We:	re special t	techniques succe	ssful		1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	776/ 948	3.33	4.16	3.95	4.03	3.33
				Frequ	encs	, Diet	trib	1+ i 01	<b>1</b>									
				11040	cricy	DIS	CLID	20101	.1									
Credi	ts Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ty	pe			Majors	3
00-2	7 0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	 5	1	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	r	2
28-5	5 1	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			-						3 -		
56-8		2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	L				0	Under-g	rad	2	Non-	major	2
84-1		3.00-3.49	0	D 0									3				-	
Grad	ad. 2 3.50-4.00 4 F 0				Electives				0 #### - Means there are not enoug			јh						
			P 0										respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0				Otl	ner					3							
				? 0														

Course-Section: LLC 750C 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 GLOBALIZED COMMUNICATI Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BICKEL, BEVERLY

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 2

84-150

Grad.

0

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

0

2

D

F

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

0

0

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1044

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

		0	_		Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4			_	Instructor Mean Rank		Course	_		Level	Sect			
		Question	5 		NK	NA				4	5 	mean	Kank	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did	you gain 1	new insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.67	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did	the instr	uctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.60	4.23	4.34	5.00
4. Did	other eval	luations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.58	4.20	4.35	5.00
5. Did	assigned :	readings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.50	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did	written as	ssignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was	the gradin	ng system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.59	4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How	many time:	s was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How	. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes					0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.40	4.06	4.20	5.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was	lecture ma	aterial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did	the lectur	res contribute to	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did	audiovisua	al techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.08	3.98	4.10	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	cussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.54	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were	all stude	ents actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did	the instru	uctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.70	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were	special t	techniques succe	ssful		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.16	3.95	4.03	5.00
Fred					iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	<b>;</b>
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2								0	 Graduat		0	Majo		2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0	Required for Majors		>	U	Graduat	C	U	Majc	)T	2				
26-33 56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General			2	Under-q	rad	2	Non-	-major	0				
30-63	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General					4	onder-9	Lau	4	14011-	illa JUI	U		

Electives

Other

0

0

Course-Section: LLC 750D 0101 University of Maryland Title THEORIES OF FEMINISM Baltimore County Fall 2008

MCCANN, CAROLE Instructor: Enrollment: 2

Questionnaires: 2

Page 1045 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	2			Instructor		Course	e Dept UMBC Leve		Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	^	0	0	^	_	F 00	1 /1 6 4 0	F 00	4 67	4 00	1 10	F 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.67	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.60	4.23	4.34	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.75	4.27	4.44	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.58	4.20	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1533	5.00	4.50	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.59	4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.86	4.69	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.52	5.00
		-		0	0	0			,				1.02	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.41	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.70	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.16	3.95	4.03	5.00
1. Here opecial econniques successful	U	_	5	3	5	5	_	3.00	1, 510	3.00	1.10	3.75	1.03	3.00
Frequ	encv	Dist	rib	utio	า									
11040					-									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
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.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Ī
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	Λ						

## Course-Section: LLC 750E 0101 University of Maryland LITERACY ACROSS THE AG Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1046

Title FILBERT, TERESA Fall 2008 Instructor:

Enrollment:	3				
Questionnaires:	3	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

					Frequencies			Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did	you gain	new insights, ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.67	4.28	4.46	4.67
2. Did	the inst	ructor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.60	4.23	4.34	4.67
4. Did	other eva	aluations reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.58	4.20	4.35	4.67
5. Did	assigned	readings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.50	4.04	4.28	4.67
6. Did	written a	assignments conti	ribute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was	the grad	ing system clearl	y expl	ained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.33
8. How	many time	es was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How	would you	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.33		
1. Wer	Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1460/1568	3.50	4.56	4.43	4.52	3.50
2. Did	the inst	ructor seem inter	rested	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.88	4.70	4.83	4.67
3. Was	lecture :	material presente	ed and	explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.47	4.28	4.41	4.00
4. Did	the lect	ures contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.41	4.50
5. Did	audiovis	ual techniques er	hance	your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.08	3.98	4.10	5.00
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did	class di	scussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.67
2. Wer	e all stud	dents actively er	courag	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.33
3. Did	the inst	ructor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.70	4.30	4.56	4.67
	Fre						trib	utio:	n									
Credit	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Re	ason	S			Ty	pe			Majors	
					S 													
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Require			ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	е	2	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 0							_							
56-83	()	2.00-2.99	()	C = 0		General			General 1		1	∐nder-a	rad	1	Non-	maior	2.	

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

Course-Section: LLC 890 0101 University of Maryland Title RES PROPOSAL SEMINAR Baltimore County Instructor: GALINDO, CLAUDI Fall 2008

Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Page 1047

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor:	GALINDO, CLAUDI	Fall 2008
Enrollment:	2	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions						NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course					0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.67	4.28	4.46	4.50
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals					0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.60	4.23	4.34	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals					0	1	0	0	0	1	0		1067/1595		4.58	4.20	4.35	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.50	4.04	4.28	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.50
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1241/1572		4.88	4.70	4.83	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564		4.47	4.28	4.41	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.41	4.50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384		4.54	4.08	4.30	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382		4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion						0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.70	4.30	4.56	4.50
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.63	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.88	4.47	4.50	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92		4.88	4.35	4.42	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear						0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	4.88	3.68	3.87	5.00
				Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Type			Majors		
00-27	0 0.00-0.99 0 A 0					Required for Majors					. – – –	0	Graduat			Major		2
28-55	** =: * **** **** * * * * * * * * * * *				1/6/	4011¢	_u _ (	J⊥ 1*10	בייני	,	U	Graduat	_	4	Ma JC	<i>,</i> _	۷	
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	General					0	Under-grad 0		0	Non-major		0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		CCITCLAL					J	onder g	Luu	J	14011		J	
				F 0		Electives						0	#### - Means there are not enough					
P 2						FIECCIACS						-	respons				_	,
I 0 Other								ther				2	10000115	L	c bigi			
? 0						001						_						