

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	598/1509	4.50	4.84	4.31	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	992/1509	4.13	4.64	4.26	4.25	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.59	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1127/1459	3.86	4.31	4.22	4.16	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	971/1406	3.86	4.40	4.09	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	589/1384	4.29	4.53	4.11	4.16	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1155/1489	3.83	4.44	4.17	4.14	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	682/1506	4.86	4.73	4.67	4.71	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.48	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	1071/1438	4.25	4.72	4.46	4.49	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.88	4.88	4.73	4.78	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	985/1411	4.13	4.64	4.31	4.33	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1145/1405	3.88	4.64	4.32	4.33	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	0	2	3	3.71	877/1236	3.71	4.31	4.00	3.98	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	370/1260	4.57	4.77	4.14	4.21	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	390/1255	4.71	4.83	4.33	4.43	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	802/1258	4.29	4.76	4.38	4.50	4.29
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	780/ 873	3.20	4.02	4.03	4.01	3.20
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	77/ 89	3.67	4.67	4.49	4.39	3.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	65/ 92	4.33	4.61	4.54	4.52	4.33
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	90/ 90	2.67	4.51	4.50	4.48	2.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	81/ 92	3.67	4.49	4.38	4.30	3.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	73/ 93	3.50	4.20	4.06	4.04	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.11	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	3	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	5	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	0				

Course-Section: LLC 635 1
 Title Soc Cult Lrng Theor
 Instructor: Shelton,Nancy R
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 938
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.84	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	300/1509	4.71	4.64	4.26	4.25	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	708/1287	4.33	4.59	4.30	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	121/1459	4.86	4.31	4.22	4.16	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1406	4.83	4.40	4.09	4.12	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.53	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	458/1489	4.50	4.44	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1070/1506	4.50	4.73	4.67	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.48	4.09	4.15	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.72	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.64	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.31	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	172/1260	4.86	4.77	4.14	4.21	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.83	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.76	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.02	4.03	4.01	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	35/ 89	4.83	4.67	4.49	4.39	4.83
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.61	4.54	4.52	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 90	5.00	4.51	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	36/ 92	4.67	4.49	4.38	4.30	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	53/ 93	4.00	4.20	4.06	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 640 1
 Title Soc, Culture & Diversi
 Instructor: Temple,Christel
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 939
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.84	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	175/1509	4.83	4.64	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1287	4.50	4.59	4.30	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	454/1459	4.50	4.31	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.40	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.53	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.44	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.73	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	151/1463	4.75	4.48	4.09	4.15	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.72	4.46	4.49	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	416/1411	4.67	4.64	4.31	4.33	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	251/1405	4.83	4.64	4.32	4.33	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	90/1236	4.83	4.31	4.00	3.98	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.77	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.83	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.76	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	4	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	705/ 873	3.50	4.02	4.03	4.01	3.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	4.67	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	73/ 92	4.00	4.61	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.51	4.50	4.48	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 92	4.67	4.49	4.38	4.30	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 93	4.67	4.20	4.06	4.04	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors				

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	5	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LLC 644 1
 Title Methods Of LLC Researc
 Instructor: Mallinson,Chris
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 940
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	410/1509	4.67	4.84	4.31	4.39	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	356/1509	4.67	4.64	4.26	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.59	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	502/1406	4.33	4.40	4.09	4.12	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.53	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.44	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.73	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.48	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.72	4.46	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1257/1421	4.33	4.88	4.73	4.78	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.64	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.64	4.32	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	421/1236	4.33	4.31	4.00	3.98	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.77	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.83	4.33	4.43	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.76	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.02	4.03	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 1	Major 3	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 2	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 responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	0		
				? 0				

Course-Section: LLC 646 1
 Title Quant Research Methods
 Instructor: Galindo, Claudia
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 941
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.84	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	774/1509	4.33	4.64	4.26	4.25	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.59	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	280/1459	4.67	4.31	4.22	4.16	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1105/1406	3.67	4.40	4.09	4.12	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	225/1384	4.67	4.53	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	597/1489	4.40	4.44	4.17	4.14	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	722/1506	4.83	4.73	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	248/1463	4.60	4.48	4.09	4.15	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	319/1438	4.83	4.72	4.46	4.49	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.88	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	957/1411	4.17	4.64	4.31	4.33	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.64	4.32	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	274/1236	4.50	4.31	4.00	3.98	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.77	4.14	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.83	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	818/1258	4.25	4.76	4.38	4.50	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.02	4.03	4.01	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	51/ 89	4.67	4.67	4.49	4.39	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	32/ 92	4.83	4.61	4.54	4.52	4.83
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	30/ 90	4.83	4.51	4.50	4.48	4.83
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	47/ 92	4.50	4.49	4.38	4.30	4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	1	0	0	4	0	3.40	74/ 93	3.40	4.20	4.06	4.04	3.40

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors

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

Course-Section: LLC 750 1
 Title Topics In LLC
 Instructor: Shin,Sarah J
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 942
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1509	4.96	4.84	4.31	4.39	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	322/1509	4.72	4.64	4.26	4.25	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	326/1287	4.70	4.59	4.30	4.22	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	715/1459	4.30	4.31	4.22	4.16	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	117/1406	4.86	4.40	4.09	4.12	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	149/1384	4.63	4.53	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	82/1489	4.89	4.44	4.17	4.14	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	524/1506	4.83	4.73	4.67	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	545/1463	4.29	4.48	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	348/1438	4.91	4.72	4.46	4.49	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	429/1421	4.96	4.88	4.73	4.78	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	568/1411	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.33	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	419/1405	4.70	4.64	4.32	4.33	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	664/1236	3.90	4.31	4.00	3.98	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1260	4.86	4.77	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	184/1255	4.96	4.83	4.33	4.43	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.89	4.76	4.38	4.50	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	366/ 873	4.40	4.02	4.03	4.01	4.20
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 89	4.94	4.67	4.49	4.39	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	30/ 92	4.74	4.61	4.54	4.52	4.86
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 90	4.94	4.51	4.50	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	30/ 92	4.73	4.49	4.38	4.30	4.71
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 93	4.81	4.20	4.06	4.04	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	12	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	9	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LLC 750 2
 Title Topics In LLC
 Instructor: Galindo,Claudia
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 943
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1509	4.96	4.84	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509	4.72	4.64	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1287	4.70	4.59	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	737/1459	4.30	4.31	4.22	4.16	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	103/1406	4.86	4.40	4.09	4.12	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	349/1384	4.63	4.53	4.11	4.16	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	121/1489	4.89	4.44	4.17	4.14	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	845/1506	4.83	4.73	4.67	4.71	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	628/1463	4.29	4.48	4.09	4.15	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1438	4.91	4.72	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1421	4.96	4.88	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1411	4.77	4.64	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	393/1405	4.70	4.64	4.32	4.33	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	824/1236	3.90	4.31	4.00	3.98	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	272/1260	4.86	4.77	4.14	4.21	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1255	4.96	4.83	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	299/1258	4.89	4.76	4.38	4.50	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	178/ 873	4.40	4.02	4.03	4.01	4.60
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	33/ 89	4.94	4.67	4.49	4.39	4.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	54/ 92	4.74	4.61	4.54	4.52	4.63
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	28/ 90	4.94	4.51	4.50	4.48	4.88
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	25/ 92	4.73	4.49	4.38	4.30	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	28/ 93	4.81	4.20	4.06	4.04	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 6 Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2 Under-grad 4 Non-major 6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LLC 890 1
 Title Res Proposal Seminar
 Instructor: Bickel, Beverly
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 944
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.84	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.64	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	4.59	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.31	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1045/1406	3.75	4.40	4.09	4.12	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.53	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.44	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.73	4.67	4.71	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	4	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	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.	4	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	4						