

Course-Section: MLL 190 0101
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1122
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	1	4	4	14	4.08	1129/1649	4.16	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	13	4.08	1076/1648	4.24	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	7	13	4.08	922/1375	4.24	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.08	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	4	13	3.96	1121/1595	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.96	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	8	11	4.08	761/1533	4.00	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	4	7	8	3.67	1170/1512	3.69	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	1	3	18	4.36	683/1623	4.47	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	1059/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.64	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	3	3	7	5	3.63	1281/1621	3.90	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.63	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	5	5	11	4.04	1261/1568	4.36	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.04	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	1165/1572	4.63	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.58	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	2	3	7	10	3.88	1235/1564	4.17	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	6	4	11	3.96	1159/1559	4.14	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	2	6	12	4.13	607/1352	4.20	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	981/1384	3.95	4.28	4.08	3.86	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	0	6	4	4.18	875/1382	4.14	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	832/1368	4.44	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	8	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 948	****	4.10	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	7	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	3	Under-grad	25	Non-major	22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

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	2	0	1	1	3	6	14	4.24	986/1649	4.16	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	3	5	16	4.40	702/1648	4.24	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	4	3	17	4.40	665/1375	4.24	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	11	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	1027/1595	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	1	4	6	10	3.91	905/1533	4.00	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	6	2	2	3	3	8	3.72	1137/1512	3.69	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.72	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	1	4	18	4.58	416/1623	4.47	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	10	4.42	1277/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	11	10	4.16	789/1621	3.90	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.16	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	2	20	4.67	636/1568	4.36	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	2	20	4.67	1071/1572	4.63	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	3	3	17	4.46	715/1564	4.17	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	3	16	4.33	901/1559	4.14	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	0	4	5	13	4.26	508/1352	4.20	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.26	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	726/1384	3.95	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	4	1	5	4.10	923/1382	4.14	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	579/1368	4.44	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	16	7	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	****/ 948	****	4.10	3.95	3.75	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	2	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	1	4	0	0	0	1.80	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	27	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MLL 204 0101
 Title: DIVERSITY & PLURALISM
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1124
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	4	8	5	1	2	2.45	1641/1649	2.45	4.34	4.28	4.29	2.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	6	7	4	3	0	2.20	1644/1648	2.20	4.31	4.23	4.25	2.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	8	5	1	2.95	1335/1375	2.95	4.42	4.27	4.37	2.95	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	4	7	6	2	0	2.32	1589/1595	2.32	4.29	4.20	4.22	2.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	6	4	5	3	3.05	1432/1533	3.05	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.05	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	7	2	2	2.65	1488/1512	2.65	4.19	4.10	4.14	2.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	7	3	5	3	1	2.37	1607/1623	2.37	4.08	4.16	4.21	2.37	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	17	1	3.95	1574/1646	3.95	4.59	4.69	4.63	3.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	4	2	5	3	0	2.50	1588/1621	2.50	4.14	4.06	4.01	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	7	7	4	1	0	1.95	1565/1568	1.95	4.39	4.43	4.39	1.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	3	4	4	9	3.95	1477/1572	3.95	4.79	4.70	4.73	3.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	2	9	2	0	2.37	1551/1564	2.37	4.28	4.28	4.27	2.37	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	6	4	2	0	2.05	1548/1559	2.05	4.43	4.29	4.33	2.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	5	2	6	0	1	2.29	1326/1352	2.29	3.97	3.98	4.07	2.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	5	5	2	3.12	1244/1384	3.12	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.12	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	1	3	6	6	3.88	1038/1382	3.88	4.57	4.29	4.19	3.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	4	2	5	4	2	2.88	1315/1368	2.88	4.42	4.30	4.21	2.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	2	1	5	3	5	3.50	699/ 948	3.50	4.10	3.95	3.89	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.47	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	1	0	3	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 20	Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MLL 213 0101
 Title FILM AND SOCIETY SPAIN
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 44
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1125
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	3	3	7	12	3.89	1287/1649	3.89	4.34	4.28	4.29	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	4	2	4	10	7	3.52	1477/1648	3.52	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	3	3	9	9	3.77	1107/1375	3.77	4.42	4.27	4.37	3.77	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	3	2	5	7	10	3.70	1311/1595	3.70	4.29	4.20	4.22	3.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	7	12	3.82	996/1533	3.82	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.82	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	2	8	7	7	3.58	1221/1512	3.58	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.58	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	1	6	8	9	3.70	1299/1623	3.70	4.08	4.16	4.21	3.70	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	816/1646	4.81	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	4	4	10	6	3.64	1274/1621	3.64	4.14	4.06	4.01	3.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	1	2	10	10	4.00	1279/1568	4.00	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	2	22	4.69	1034/1572	4.69	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	3	3	11	7	3.80	1273/1564	3.80	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	2	3	6	12	3.96	1151/1559	3.96	4.43	4.29	4.33	3.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	1	22	4.80	133/1352	4.80	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	1	7	11	4.35	592/1384	4.35	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	2	2	7	9	4.15	893/1382	4.15	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	3	4	2	9	3.65	1131/1368	3.65	4.42	4.30	4.21	3.65	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	13	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	4.10	3.95	3.89	3.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	2	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	12
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 215 0101
 Title FRENCH FILM CLASSICS
 Instructor: BAZGAN, NICOLET
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1126
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	8	14	4.57	563/1649	4.57	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	323/1648	4.70	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.70	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	412/1375	4.65	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	648/1595	4.39	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.39	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	0	8	12	4.13	725/1533	4.13	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	9	12	4.39	532/1512	4.39	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	20	4.65	333/1623	4.65	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	665/1621	4.28	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.28	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.39	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	178/1564	4.89	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	227/1559	4.89	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	104/1352	4.89	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	284/1384	4.71	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	2	2	2	7	3.86	1050/1382	3.86	4.57	4.29	4.19	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	316/1368	4.86	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.00	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	3.75	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	3.33	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 0
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	
					Other 1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1127
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	2	8	18	4.37	830/1649	4.37	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	9	14	4.13	1032/1648	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	9	16	4.30	763/1375	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	2	4	9	8	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	6	6	16	4.24	633/1533	4.24	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	2	5	6	10	3.80	1089/1512	3.80	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	9	15	4.24	826/1623	4.24	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	2	12	6	3.87	1096/1621	4.10	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	10	16	4.50	852/1568	4.62	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	6	21	4.71	1003/1572	4.73	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	9	15	4.29	908/1564	4.53	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	9	15	4.29	945/1559	4.45	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	5	5	15	4.27	508/1352	4.38	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	582/1384	4.37	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	464/1382	4.68	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	327/1368	4.84	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	257/ 948	4.44	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.44	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 50
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1128
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	2	8	18	4.37	830/1649	4.37	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	9	14	4.13	1032/1648	4.13	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	9	16	4.30	763/1375	4.30	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	2	4	9	8	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	6	6	16	4.24	633/1533	4.24	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	4	2	2	5	6	10	3.80	1089/1512	3.80	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	9	15	4.24	826/1623	4.24	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.24	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	595/1621	4.10	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	517/1568	4.62	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	8	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	967/1572	4.73	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	8	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	294/1564	4.53	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	586/1559	4.45	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	0	3	5	14	4.50	303/1352	4.38	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	582/1384	4.37	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.37	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	6	13	4.68	464/1382	4.68	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.68	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	327/1368	4.84	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.84	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	257/ 948	4.44	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.44	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	29	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.65	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	22
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	31	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	27				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1129
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	5	6	4	3.65	1443/1649	3.65	4.34	4.28	4.27	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	4	4	3.41	1522/1648	3.41	4.31	4.23	4.18	3.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	9	5	4.06	932/1375	4.06	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	1032/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	7	5	3.88	935/1533	3.88	4.16	4.04	4.05	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	966/1512	3.94	4.19	4.10	4.11	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	3	3	3	4	3.13	1517/1623	3.13	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	897/1646	4.76	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	2	3	6	3	3.71	1225/1621	3.71	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	3	6	4	3.59	1444/1568	3.59	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.59	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	1352/1572	4.35	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	3	6	5	3.76	1292/1564	3.76	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.76	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	6	4	5	3.59	1349/1559	3.59	4.43	4.29	4.23	3.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	0	3	4	8	3.94	766/1352	3.94	3.97	3.98	3.97	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	667/1384	4.27	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	0	3	11	4.53	593/1382	4.53	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.53	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	2	0	2	11	4.47	693/1368	4.47	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	0	2	5	5	3.79	587/ 948	3.79	4.10	3.95	4.00	3.79	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		

Course-Section: MLL 305 0101
 Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1130
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	0	0	6	11	4.44	723/1649	4.44	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	498/1648	4.56	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	271/1375	4.78	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	545/1533	4.33	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	451/1512	4.45	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	581/1623	4.44	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1175/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	3	12	4.56	322/1621	4.56	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	715/1568	4.61	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.61
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	894/1572	4.78	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	600/1564	4.56	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	607/1559	4.59	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	389/1352	4.41	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	412/1384	4.55	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	425/1382	4.73	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	264/1368	4.91	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	8	4	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	389/ 948	4.14	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	3	1	1	1	1	2.43	515/ 555	2.43	2.56	4.29	4.22	2.43
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	0	3	0	2	1	3.17	222/ 288	3.17	2.95	3.68	3.58	3.17
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	232/ 312	3.40	2.48	3.68	3.60	3.40
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: MLL 305 0101
 Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 72
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1130
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	19	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 328 0101
 Title CHINESE FICTION & DRAM
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1131
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	1	0	3	12	4.41	762/1649	4.41	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	226/1375	4.81	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	225/1533	4.69	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	359/1512	4.53	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44	595/1623	4.44	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	1356/1646	4.31	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	7	6	4.21	731/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	372/1568	4.81	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	342/1564	4.75	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	561/1559	4.63	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	2	0	4	3	3	3.42	1095/1352	3.42	3.97	3.98	3.97	3.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	455/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	2	0	0	2	2	3.33	776/ 948	3.33	4.10	3.95	4.00	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	3	0	2	0	2.50	279/ 312	2.50	2.48	3.68	3.60	2.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.05	****

Course-Section: MLL 328 0101
 Title CHINESE FICTION & DRAM
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1131
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	1	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 370 0101
 Title 19TH CENT RUSS LIT/SOC
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1132
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1649	4.63	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	897/1648	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	672/1595	4.38	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	272/1533	4.63	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	5	9	4.25	687/1512	4.25	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	815/1623	4.25	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	8	6	4.13	1491/1646	4.13	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	4	3	8	4.27	676/1621	4.27	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	301/1568	4.87	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.87	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	690/1572	4.87	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.87	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	702/1564	4.47	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	749/1559	4.47	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	3	1	9	4.00	690/1352	4.00	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	851/1382	4.22	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	860/1368	4.22	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	645/ 948	3.67	4.10	3.95	4.00	3.67	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	13	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	2	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	253/ 288	2.50	2.95	3.68	3.58	2.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	3	4	1	0	2	0	2.00	291/ 312	2.00	2.48	3.68	3.60	2.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.05	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course-Section: MLL 406 0101
 Title INTERCULTURAL MEDIA TH
 Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1133
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	4.71	372/1649	4.71	4.34	4.28	4.50	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1021/1648	4.14	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	464/1375	4.60	4.42	4.27	4.48	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	782/1595	4.29	4.29	4.20	4.36	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	311/1533	4.57	4.16	4.04	4.14	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	225/1512	4.71	4.19	4.10	4.26	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	608/1623	4.43	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	748/1646	4.86	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1261/1621	3.67	4.14	4.06	4.24	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	956/1568	4.43	4.39	4.43	4.54	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	715/1572	4.86	4.79	4.70	4.79	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	580/1564	4.57	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	804/1559	4.43	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.97	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	520/1384	4.43	4.28	4.08	4.35	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	435/1382	4.71	4.57	4.29	4.56	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.58	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.10	3.95	4.31	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.73	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.61	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	1	0	0	0	1.50	544/ 555	1.50	2.56	4.29	4.41	1.50	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.54	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.57	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.44	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	2.95	3.68	3.71	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	4.86	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.42	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.52	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.59	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	308/ 312	1.00	2.48	3.68	3.95	1.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.64	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.84	****	

Course-Section: MLL 406 0101
 Title INTERCULTURAL MEDIA TH
 Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1133
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	2	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	5	Non-major	7
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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 603 0101
 Title POLI ECONOMY OF CULTUR
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1134
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	238/1649	4.85	4.34	4.28	4.46	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	253/1648	4.77	4.31	4.23	4.34	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	133/1375	4.92	4.42	4.27	4.44	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	352/1595	4.64	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	85/1533	4.92	4.16	4.04	4.28	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	627/1512	4.31	4.19	4.10	4.35	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	659/1623	4.38	4.08	4.16	4.29	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.14	4.06	4.20	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.39	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	326/1564	4.77	4.28	4.28	4.41	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	263/1352	4.57	3.97	3.98	4.10	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	247/1384	4.75	4.28	4.08	4.30	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.57	4.29	4.52	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.56	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.10	3.95	4.03	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/ 288	4.75	2.95	3.68	3.87	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 5
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 9
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	10

Course-Section: MLL 605 0101
 Title FIELD OF INTERCULT COM
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1135
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	5	3	3.91	1272/1649	3.91	4.34	4.28	4.46	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	334/1375	4.73	4.42	4.27	4.44	4.73		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	3	0	5	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	4.29	4.20	4.35	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	4	3	3.73	1093/1533	3.73	4.16	4.04	4.28	3.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	595/1512	4.33	4.19	4.10	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	0	5	3.73	1287/1623	3.73	4.08	4.16	4.29	3.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1225/1621	3.71	4.14	4.06	4.20	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	1239/1568	4.09	4.39	4.43	4.52	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1203/1572	4.55	4.79	4.70	4.83	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.28	4.28	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	1	4	4	3.73	1295/1559	3.73	4.43	4.29	4.41	3.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	399/1352	4.40	3.97	3.98	4.10	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	5	2	3.60	1039/1384	3.60	4.28	4.08	4.30	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	716/1382	4.40	4.57	4.29	4.52	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	264/1368	4.90	4.42	4.30	4.56	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	542/ 948	3.89	4.10	3.95	4.03	3.89	
Laboratory															
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.66	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	82/ 88	3.78	4.39	4.54	4.63	3.78	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	66/ 85	4.11	4.20	4.47	4.50	4.11	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	75/ 81	3.67	4.23	4.43	4.43	3.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	1	2	3.11	89/ 92	3.11	4.32	4.35	4.42	3.11	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	2	3	0	2	3.00	229/ 288	3.00	2.95	3.68	3.87	3.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	279/ 312	2.50	2.48	3.68	3.83	2.50	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	4	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 690A 0101
 Title THEO APPR TO INTER COM
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1136
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	0	6	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.31	4.23	4.34	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.42	4.27	4.44	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	4.83	4.29	4.20	4.35	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.16	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.19	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.08	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.14	4.06	4.20	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	636/1568	4.67	4.39	4.43	4.52	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	234/1564	4.83	4.28	4.28	4.41	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	3.97	3.98	4.10	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.30	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.57	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	342/ 948	4.25	4.10	3.95	4.03	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	4.39	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.20	4.47	4.50	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	26/ 81	4.80	4.23	4.43	4.43	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.32	4.35	4.42	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	20/ 288	4.80	2.95	3.68	3.87	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

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