

Course-Section: MLL 205 0101  
 Title GREAT BOOKS: FRENCH  
 Instructor: STERN, GALA  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1026  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	290/1522	4.78	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	358/1522	4.67	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	258/1285	4.78	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	406/1476	4.57	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.57	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1412	4.89	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	190/1500	4.78	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	1	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	333/1497	4.57	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	412/1440	4.78	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	263/1436	4.78	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	327/1432	4.78	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1221	****	3.91	3.93	4.02	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	343/1280	4.57	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.33	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1269	4.57	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	625/ 854	3.67	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: MLL 218 0101  
 Title FILM & SOC IN LATIN AM  
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1027  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	4	0	3	5	3.75	1295/1522	3.75	4.36	4.30	4.34	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	3	2	3	3.33	1419/1522	3.33	4.33	4.26	4.29	3.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1088/1285	3.75	4.45	4.30	4.36	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	934/1476	4.13	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	11	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1412	****	4.26	4.06	4.00	****	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	1	1	7	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	3	5	3.92	1078/1500	3.92	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1113/1497	3.80	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	821/1448	4.78	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	906/1436	4.22	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	1182/1432	3.78	4.47	4.29	4.31	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	246/1221	4.56	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1123/1280	3.29	4.28	4.10	4.08	3.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	879/1277	4.14	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	654/1269	4.43	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 854	****	4.16	4.02	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: MLL 220 0101  
 Title FILM & SOCIETY IN CHIN  
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1028  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	3	12	4.35	791/1522	4.35	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	432/1522	4.60	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	4	10	4.26	781/1476	4.26	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.26	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	493/1412	4.33	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	272/1381	4.58	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	630/1500	4.40	4.14	4.18	4.20	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	14	5	4.20	1301/1517	4.20	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	852/1497	4.07	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	740/1440	4.55	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	765/1448	4.80	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	601/1436	4.50	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	527/1432	4.60	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	156/1221	4.70	3.91	3.93	4.02	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	253/1280	4.71	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	421/1277	4.71	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	277/1269	4.86	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	10	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 854	****	4.16	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 280 0101  
 Title INTRO SPAN SPKNG WORLD  
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1029  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	2	1	3	9	4.06	1081/1522	4.06	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	5	5	3.88	1206/1522	3.88	4.33	4.26	4.29	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	9	4.25	766/1285	4.25	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	2	11	4.31	724/1476	4.31	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	402/1412	4.44	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	3	9	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	4	4	4	3.31	1384/1500	3.31	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.31	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	1268/1517	4.25	4.56	4.65	4.63	4.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	1	4	3	3	3.50	1277/1497	3.50	4.21	4.11	4.11	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	2	3	7	3.80	1287/1440	3.80	4.45	4.45	4.42	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	1072/1448	4.60	4.79	4.71	4.78	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	3	5	5	3.73	1218/1436	3.73	4.39	4.29	4.29	3.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	2	6	3.67	1224/1432	3.67	4.47	4.29	4.31	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	818/1221	3.69	3.91	3.93	4.02	3.69	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	442/1280	4.44	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	560/1277	4.56	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	547/1269	4.56	4.47	4.31	4.33	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	1	1	6	4.22	347/ 854	4.22	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101  
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1030  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	7	2	12	11	12	3.43	1429/1522	3.43	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.34	3.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	15	15	3.86	1211/1522	3.86	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.25	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	7	14	18	4.07	898/1285	4.07	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.30	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	7	13	17	3.84	1155/1476	3.84	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.26	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	5	12	10	11	3.40	1229/1412	3.40	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.03	3.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	5	8	10	14	3.49	1161/1381	3.49	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.13	3.49
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	5	8	12	15	3.72	1204/1500	3.72	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.13	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	3	38	4.88	532/1517	4.88	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.62	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	6	3	9	19	4	3.29	1358/1497	3.42	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.13	3.42
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	8	4	28	4.20	1088/1440	4.12	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.12
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	3	1	6	12	21	4.09	1343/1448	4.09	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.71	4.09
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	4	6	4	18	12	3.64	1251/1436	3.53	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.30	3.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	3	5	12	18	3.75	1191/1432	3.67	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.29	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	3	4	7	13	16	3.81	752/1221	3.82	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.94	3.82
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	6	2	8	12	3	3.13	1172/1280	3.13	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.14	3.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	4	3	7	15	3.94	988/1277	3.94	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.38	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	3	4	9	12	3.77	1019/1269	3.77	4.47	4.31	4.39	4.39	3.77
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	4	4	6	9	4	3.19	751/ 854	3.19	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.00	3.19
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.29	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.45	4.45	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	4.35	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	4.26	****
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	4.34	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.33	3.33	****
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.56	4.56	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.39	4.39	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.26	4.26	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.12	4.12	****
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	5.00	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	4.75	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	****

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101  
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAIN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1030  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	44	Non-major	15
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	4						

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101  
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1031  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	7	2	12	11	12	3.43	1429/1522	3.43	4.36	4.30	4.34	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	9	15	15	3.86	1211/1522	3.86	4.33	4.26	4.25	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	2	1	7	14	18	4.07	898/1285	4.07	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	7	13	17	3.84	1155/1476	3.84	4.33	4.22	4.26	3.84	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	5	12	10	11	3.40	1229/1412	3.40	4.26	4.06	4.03	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	6	5	8	10	14	3.49	1161/1381	3.49	4.19	4.08	4.13	3.49	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	5	8	12	15	3.72	1204/1500	3.72	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	3	38	4.88	532/1517	4.88	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	6	12	13	7	3.55	1258/1497	3.42	4.21	4.11	4.13	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	5	7	7	18	4.03	1178/1440	4.12	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.12	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	3	0	6	9	18	4.08	1344/1448	4.09	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.09	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	1	7	9	15	5	3.43	1305/1436	3.53	4.39	4.29	4.30	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	5	3	11	13	3.59	1245/1432	3.67	4.47	4.29	4.29	3.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	1	0	5	7	11	11	3.82	746/1221	3.82	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	6	2	8	12	3	3.13	1172/1280	3.13	4.28	4.10	4.14	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	4	3	7	15	3.94	988/1277	3.94	4.60	4.34	4.38	3.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	3	4	9	12	3.77	1019/1269	3.77	4.47	4.31	4.39	3.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	4	4	4	6	9	4	3.19	751/ 854	3.19	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.19	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.50	4.51	4.45	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.35	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 205	****	5.00	4.23	4.26	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.34	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.56	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.39	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.68	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.26	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.12	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	****	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.69	4.75	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	****	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	43	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	****	****	

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101  
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 60  
 Questionnaires: 44

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1031  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	20	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	29
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	44	Non-major	15
84-150	18	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	22	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	39				
				?	4						



Course-Section: MLL 306 0101  
 Title INCC: COMMUNITY ISSUES  
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1032  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1220/1522	3.90	4.36	4.30	4.34	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1365/1522	3.50	4.33	4.26	4.25	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	1078/1285	3.78	4.45	4.30	4.30	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	1009/1476	4.00	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	594/1412	4.22	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	2	3	3.56	1141/1381	3.56	4.19	4.08	4.13	3.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	3.10	1422/1500	3.10	4.14	4.18	4.13	3.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1405/1497	3.13	4.21	4.11	4.13	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	1379/1440	3.38	4.45	4.45	4.46	3.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.79	4.71	4.71	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	1254/1436	3.63	4.39	4.29	4.30	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1191/1432	3.75	4.47	4.29	4.29	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	808/1221	3.71	3.91	3.93	3.94	3.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	1	2	3	3.63	1106/1277	3.63	4.60	4.34	4.38	3.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	972/1269	3.88	4.47	4.31	4.39	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	569/ 854	3.80	4.16	4.02	4.00	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	40/ 47	3.60	3.60	4.41	4.56	3.60	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	30/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.39	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	35/ 39	3.00	3.00	4.40	4.68	3.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	32/ 35	3.00	3.00	4.31	4.26	3.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	34/ 34	2.75	2.75	4.30	4.12	2.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 10
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	2

Course-Section: MLL 470 0101  
 Title L2 ACQUISITION/LEARNIN  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1033  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	3	3	4	0	2.91	1497/1522	2.91	4.36	4.30	4.42	2.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	3	3	0	2.64	1505/1522	2.64	4.33	4.26	4.34	2.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1285	****	4.45	4.30	4.42	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	4	4	1	0	2.50	1462/1476	2.50	4.33	4.22	4.31	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	3	0	2.73	1370/1412	2.73	4.26	4.06	4.11	2.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	4	3	0	2.73	1342/1381	2.73	4.19	4.08	4.21	2.73	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	3	2	2	0	2.44	1473/1500	2.44	4.14	4.18	4.25	2.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	855/1517	4.73	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	6	1	0	2.88	1441/1497	2.88	4.21	4.11	4.21	2.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	5	1	3	3.36	1381/1440	3.36	4.45	4.45	4.52	3.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	1353/1448	4.00	4.79	4.71	4.75	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	2	4	4	0	3.00	1378/1436	3.00	4.39	4.29	4.32	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	1287/1432	3.45	4.47	4.29	4.34	3.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	4	1	1	1	2.63	1152/1221	2.63	3.91	3.93	4.04	2.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	1	2	3.09	1178/1280	3.09	4.28	4.10	4.28	3.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1103/1277	3.64	4.60	4.34	4.50	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	6	3	2	3.64	1085/1269	3.64	4.47	4.31	4.49	3.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	3	2	2	3	3.50	673/ 854	3.50	4.16	4.02	4.31	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.65	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.58	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.14	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 11
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	6

Course-Section: MLL 601 0101  
 Title INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATI  
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1034  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	141/1522	4.92	4.36	4.30	4.45	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	11	4.69	322/1522	4.69	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	196/1285	4.85	4.45	4.30	4.31	4.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	100/1476	4.92	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	205/1412	4.69	4.26	4.06	4.25	4.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	187/1381	4.69	4.19	4.08	4.25	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	10	4.54	454/1500	4.54	4.14	4.18	4.22	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1241/1517	4.31	4.56	4.65	4.73	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	215/1497	4.73	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	288/1440	4.85	4.45	4.45	4.48	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	395/1448	4.92	4.79	4.71	4.80	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	383/1436	4.69	4.39	4.29	4.37	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	240/1432	4.85	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.91	3.93	3.83	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	222/1280	4.75	4.28	4.10	4.24	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	470/1277	4.67	4.60	4.34	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	200/1269	4.92	4.47	4.31	4.51	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	246/ 854	4.42	4.16	4.02	4.08	4.42	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	9	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	11				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 602 0101  
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC  
 Instructor: KA, OMAR (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1035  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	454/1522	4.58	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.45	4.30	4.31	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	294/1412	4.58	4.26	4.06	4.25	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	382/1381	4.45	4.19	4.08	4.25	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.14	4.18	4.22	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.56	4.65	4.73	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	172/1440	4.90	4.45	4.45	4.48	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	444/1448	4.90	4.79	4.71	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	295/1436	4.71	4.39	4.29	4.37	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	350/1432	4.65	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	359/1221	4.03	3.91	3.93	3.83	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	363/1280	4.55	4.28	4.10	4.24	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	643/1277	4.45	4.60	4.34	4.52	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1269	4.91	4.47	4.31	4.51	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	538/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	4.08	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: MLL 602 0101  
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1036  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	320/1522	4.75	4.36	4.30	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	454/1522	4.58	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	278/1285	4.75	4.45	4.30	4.31	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	378/1476	4.60	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	294/1412	4.58	4.26	4.06	4.25	4.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	382/1381	4.45	4.19	4.08	4.25	4.45	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	211/1500	4.75	4.14	4.18	4.22	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.56	4.65	4.73	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1440	4.90	4.45	4.45	4.48	4.90	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	548/1448	4.90	4.79	4.71	4.80	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	415/1436	4.71	4.39	4.29	4.37	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	579/1432	4.65	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	832/1221	4.03	3.91	3.93	3.83	4.03	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	363/1280	4.55	4.28	4.10	4.24	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	643/1277	4.45	4.60	4.34	4.52	4.45	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	223/1269	4.91	4.47	4.31	4.51	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	538/ 854	3.88	4.16	4.02	4.08	3.88	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 6
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 1		

Course-Section: MLL 625 0101  
 Title INTER/CROSS-CULT COMMU  
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1037  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	1	22	4.73	350/1522	4.73	4.36	4.30	4.45	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	16	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	395/1285	4.64	4.45	4.30	4.31	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	17	4.57	305/1412	4.57	4.26	4.06	4.25	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	16	4.57	280/1381	4.57	4.19	4.08	4.25	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	1	5	2	15	4.35	690/1500	4.35	4.14	4.18	4.22	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	577/1517	4.87	4.56	4.65	4.73	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	333/1497	4.57	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	630/1440	4.64	4.45	4.45	4.48	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	198/1448	4.96	4.79	4.71	4.80	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	404/1436	4.68	4.39	4.29	4.37	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	3	18	4.35	811/1432	4.35	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	0	3	6	10	4.20	500/1221	4.20	3.91	3.93	3.83	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	184/1280	4.81	4.28	4.10	4.24	4.81	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	363/1277	4.77	4.60	4.34	4.52	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	178/1269	4.92	4.47	4.31	4.51	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	113/ 854	4.73	4.16	4.02	4.08	4.73	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 20	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 14
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	14	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 2		

Course-Section: MLL 695 0101  
 Title INTERCULT VIDEO PROD I  
 Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 1038  
 JUN 26, 2007  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	225/1522	4.83	4.36	4.30	4.45	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	545/1522	4.50	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	706/1285	4.33	4.45	4.30	4.31	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	473/1476	4.50	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.26	4.06	4.25	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	806/1381	4.00	4.19	4.08	4.25	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	700/1500	4.33	4.14	4.18	4.22	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	984/1440	4.33	4.45	4.45	4.48	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.79	4.71	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	793/1436	4.33	4.39	4.29	4.37	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1432	4.50	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	99/1221	4.80	3.91	3.93	3.83	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	585/1280	4.25	4.28	4.10	4.24	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	594/1277	4.50	4.60	4.34	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	777/1269	4.25	4.47	4.31	4.51	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.16	4.02	4.08	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	3.60	4.41	4.40	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.30	4.49	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.82	****	

Frequency Distribution

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