

Course-Section: MLL 191 0101
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 65
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1098
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	5	9	17	4.28	964/1670	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	23	4.69	390/1666	4.69	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	30	4.94	134/1406	4.94	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	0	4	14	4.63	412/1615	4.63	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	10	18	4.35	540/1566	4.35	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	19	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	546/1528	4.42	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	23	4.71	316/1650	4.71	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	21	4.68	1012/1667	4.68	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	12	12	4.33	637/1626	4.33	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	5	23	4.58	796/1559	4.58	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	596/1560	4.90	4.75	4.72	4.68	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	549/1549	4.61	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.61
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	0	2	4	21	4.57	631/1546	4.57	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	2	4	5	16	4.30	514/1323	4.30	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	3	2	10	4.47	476/1384	4.47	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	510/1378	4.63	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	460/1378	4.73	4.45	4.31	4.08	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	1	1	0	5	7	4.14	425/ 904	4.14	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.14
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.07	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.42	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	31	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	28	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	32	Non-major	25
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 218 0101
 Title FILM & SOC IN LATIN AM
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1099
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	3	6	3	7	3.74	1453/1670	3.74	4.36	4.31	4.32	3.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	2	3	5	6	3.47	1518/1666	3.47	4.31	4.27	4.27	3.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	17	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1406	****	4.48	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	4	3	9	4.06	1055/1615	4.06	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.06
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1566	****	4.26	4.07	4.00	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	2	6	7	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	1	4	4	7	3.72	1376/1650	3.72	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.72
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1271/1667	4.39	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	2	5	8	2	3.59	1354/1626	3.59	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1437/1559	3.64	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1222/1560	4.53	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	4	1	3	5	3.50	1389/1549	3.50	4.34	4.31	4.25	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	2	3	6	3.79	1281/1546	3.79	4.40	4.32	4.30	3.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	205/1323	4.71	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	0	6	6	4.14	758/1384	4.14	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	1	11	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	2	3	7	4.07	956/1378	4.07	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	12	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 904	****	4.11	4.03	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 12	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 7					
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major 18
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0					
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		
				P 0					
				I 0	Other	3			
				? 0					

Course-Section: MLL 220 0101
 Title FILM & SOCIETY IN CHIN
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1100
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	378/1666	4.70	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	495/1406	4.60	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	346/1615	4.70	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	4	10	4.10	790/1566	4.10	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	0	5	12	4.42	690/1650	4.42	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	992/1667	4.70	4.47	4.67	4.64	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	410/1549	4.72	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	445/1546	4.72	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	172/1323	4.78	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	510/1378	4.63	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	671/ 904	3.67	4.11	4.03	4.01	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 6	Under-grad 20	Non-major 18
84-150	4	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MLL 271 0101
 Title MOD RUSSIAN CIV & CULT
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1101
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	243/1670	4.87	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	542/1666	4.57	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	5	12	4.26	868/1406	4.26	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	8	11	4.30	813/1615	4.30	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	273/1566	4.70	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	10	11	4.39	570/1528	4.39	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	6	7	9	4.04	1112/1650	4.04	4.16	4.22	4.20	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	10	4.35	616/1626	4.35	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	419/1559	4.82	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	298/1560	4.95	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	9	13	4.59	574/1549	4.59	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	382/1546	4.77	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	200/1323	4.73	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	2	5	6	4.00	820/1384	4.00	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	649/1378	4.47	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.45	4.31	4.26	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	3	0	3	1	1	2.63	862/ 904	2.63	4.11	4.03	4.01	2.63
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.33	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.61	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.52	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.75	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.25	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	4.30	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	2.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	2.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.50	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	****	****

Course-Section: MLL 271 0101
 Title MOD RUSSIAN CIV & CULT
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1101
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	5	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 280 0101
 Title INTRO SPAN SPKNG WORLD
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1102
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	943/1670	4.31	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	8	0	4	3.54	1499/1666	3.54	4.31	4.27	4.27	3.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	483/1406	4.62	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1325/1615	3.75	4.34	4.24	4.29	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	331/1566	4.62	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	0	1	2	7	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1568/1650	3.10	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	6	4	2	0	2.54	1667/1667	2.54	4.47	4.67	4.64	2.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	2	1	1	2.86	1567/1626	2.86	4.08	4.11	4.06	2.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	4	2	4	3.38	1484/1559	3.38	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	1222/1560	4.54	4.75	4.72	4.73	4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	3	1	4	2	3	3.08	1484/1549	3.08	4.34	4.31	4.25	3.08
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	5	4.08	1113/1546	4.08	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	1	5	2	3.50	1040/1323	3.50	3.96	4.00	4.08	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1018/1384	3.70	4.29	4.10	4.07	3.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	1057/1378	3.90	4.56	4.29	4.25	3.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	4	2	3	3.70	1135/1378	3.70	4.45	4.31	4.26	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	890/ 904	1.75	4.11	4.03	4.01	1.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1103
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	3	6	7	23	4.28	964/1670	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	8	7	24	4.41	767/1666	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	26	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	5	7	25	4.54	509/1615	4.54	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	12	20	4.26	643/1566	4.26	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	8	25	4.47	462/1528	4.47	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	6	13	18	4.24	926/1650	4.24	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	203/1667	4.97	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	3	4	7	12	6	3.44	1421/1626	3.98	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	5	6	10	15	3.89	1356/1559	4.26	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	2	4	7	24	4.43	1302/1560	4.63	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	4	4	5	10	13	3.67	1345/1549	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	4	5	9	16	3.84	1260/1546	4.18	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	4	1	5	6	19	4.00	692/1323	4.33	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	4	4	17	4.30	644/1384	4.30	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	295/1378	4.85	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	541/1378	4.65	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	1	4	9	8	3.96	515/ 904	3.96	4.11	4.03	4.03	3.96

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	18
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 59
 Questionnaires: 41

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1104
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	3	6	7	23	4.28	964/1670	4.28	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	8	7	24	4.41	767/1666	4.41	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	26	0	0	3	0	9	4.50	597/1406	4.50	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	5	7	25	4.54	509/1615	4.54	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	4	12	20	4.26	643/1566	4.26	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	8	25	4.47	462/1528	4.47	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	6	13	18	4.24	926/1650	4.24	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	203/1667	4.97	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	2	2	5	22	4.52	395/1626	3.98	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.98
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	2	1	3	23	4.62	739/1559	4.26	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.26
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	5	24	4.83	803/1560	4.63	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	1	2	4	22	4.62	537/1549	4.14	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	3	22	4.52	703/1546	4.18	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	1	1	1	1	25	4.66	242/1323	4.33	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	1	1	4	4	17	4.30	644/1384	4.30	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	4	23	4.85	295/1378	4.85	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	1	7	18	4.65	541/1378	4.65	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.65
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	1	1	4	9	8	3.96	515/ 904	3.96	4.11	4.03	4.03	3.96

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	23
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	18						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	41	Non-major	18
84-150	16	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	16	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	35				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 305 0101
 Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1105
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	388/1670	4.74	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.74
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	241/1666	4.83	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	16	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	423/1406	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	456/1615	4.59	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	181/1566	4.82	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	4.65	308/1528	4.65	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	0	1	4	16	4.55	513/1650	4.55	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	4.39	1263/1667	4.39	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	293/1626	4.65	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	755/1559	4.62	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	298/1560	4.95	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	424/1549	4.71	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	288/1546	4.86	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	6	5	8	3.95	756/1323	3.95	3.96	4.00	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	17	4.79	235/1384	4.79	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	253/1378	4.89	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	169/1378	4.95	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	113/ 904	4.89	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.89

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 17	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 23	Non-major 22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	8	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 14		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MLL 305H 0101
 Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1106
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	967/1666	4.25	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1312/1626	3.67	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	919/1546	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1323	****	3.96	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.11	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

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

Course-Section: MLL 306 0101
 Title INCC: COMMUNITY ISSUES
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1107
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	1	1	2	2	4	3.70	1470/1670	3.70	4.36	4.31	4.24	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	2	2	3.40	1543/1666	3.40	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	1226/1406	3.70	4.48	4.32	4.22	3.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	1028/1615	4.10	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1010/1566	3.90	4.26	4.07	4.04	3.90
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1039/1528	3.90	4.23	4.12	4.07	3.90
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	1404/1650	3.67	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	8	0	3.80	1625/1667	3.80	4.47	4.67	4.67	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1448/1626	3.38	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	0	2	1	3	3.11	1514/1559	3.11	4.38	4.46	4.40	3.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	1418/1560	4.22	4.75	4.72	4.67	4.22
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1414/1549	3.44	4.34	4.31	4.25	3.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	0	4	0	3	3.50	1379/1546	3.50	4.40	4.32	4.24	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	356/1384	4.63	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	970/1378	4.00	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	653/1378	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.11	4.03	4.03	4.33
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.68	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.38	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.51	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 11	Non-major 10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MLL 322 0101
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1108
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1670	4.69	4.36	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	622/1666	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.48	4.32	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1615	4.88	4.34	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	851/1566	4.38	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1460/1650	4.06	4.16	4.22	4.12	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1384/1626	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	896/1559	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1146/1549	4.25	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1139/1546	4.25	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1040/1323	4.13	3.96	4.00	3.99	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	970/1378	4.38	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	653/1378	4.63	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	899/ 904	2.00	4.11	4.03	4.03	1.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 2	Non-major 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	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 322 0201
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1109
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	849/1670	4.69	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	1114/1666	4.31	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	4.00	4.48	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	290/1615	4.88	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	226/1566	4.38	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	421/1528	4.50	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	406/1650	4.06	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	1157/1667	4.50	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	854/1626	3.82	4.08	4.11	4.06	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	323/1559	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	683/1549	4.25	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	715/1546	4.25	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	183/1323	4.13	3.96	4.00	3.99	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.29	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	400/1378	4.38	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	439/1378	4.63	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	820/ 904	2.00	4.11	4.03	4.03	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 332 0101
 Title TOPICS IN GERMAN CULTU
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1110
 AUG 6, 2008
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.31	4.27	4.18	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.34	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.26	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.23	4.12	4.07	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.08	4.11	4.06	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1323	5.00	3.96	4.00	3.99	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 470 0101
 Title L2 ACQUISITION/LEARNIN
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1111
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	0	1	0	2	7	6	4.06	1183/1670	4.06	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1282/1666	3.94	4.31	4.27	4.35	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/1406	****	4.48	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	861/1615	4.27	4.34	4.24	4.37	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	3	5	6	3.94	962/1566	3.94	4.26	4.07	4.17	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	706/1528	4.25	4.23	4.12	4.26	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	1	7	6	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	1	4.07	1492/1667	4.07	4.47	4.67	4.73	4.07
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	2	6	0	3.75	1254/1626	3.75	4.08	4.11	4.28	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	1052/1559	4.38	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	673/1560	4.88	4.75	4.72	4.80	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	9	6	4.31	924/1549	4.31	4.34	4.31	4.43	4.31
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	5	5	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	4	4	3	4	3.47	1056/1323	3.47	3.96	4.00	4.10	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	541/1384	4.40	4.29	4.10	4.32	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	525/1378	4.60	4.56	4.29	4.55	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	813/1378	4.33	4.45	4.31	4.60	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	6	6	4.29	356/ 904	4.29	4.11	4.03	4.22	4.29
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.26	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.24	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.80	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.67	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.98	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	4.36	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.62	4.58	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.27	4.02	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.47	4.49	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.80	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Course-Section: MLL 470 0101
 Title L2 ACQUISITION/LEARNIN
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1111
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	4	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	13	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 601 0101
 Title INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATI
 Instructor: PROVENCHER, DEN
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1112
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	611/1670	4.56	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	870/1666	4.33	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	295/1406	4.78	4.48	4.32	4.36	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	499/1615	4.56	4.34	4.24	4.33	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	364/1566	4.56	4.26	4.07	4.20	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	504/1528	4.44	4.23	4.12	4.33	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	499/1650	4.56	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1022/1667	4.67	4.47	4.67	4.74	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	307/1559	4.89	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	647/1560	4.89	4.75	4.72	4.81	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	488/1549	4.67	4.34	4.31	4.37	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	382/1546	4.78	4.40	4.32	4.40	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	172/1323	4.78	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	403/1384	4.56	4.29	4.10	4.21	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	564/1378	4.56	4.56	4.29	4.42	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	531/1378	4.67	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	373/ 904	4.25	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.61	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	4.32	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 602 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC
 Instructor: KA, OMAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1113
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	262/1670	4.85	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	301/1666	4.77	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	153/1406	4.92	4.48	4.32	4.36	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1615	4.92	4.34	4.24	4.33	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	181/1566	4.82	4.26	4.07	4.20	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	152/1528	4.85	4.23	4.12	4.33	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	417/1650	4.62	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.92	4.47	4.67	4.74	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	161/1626	4.78	4.08	4.11	4.20	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	161/1549	4.91	4.34	4.31	4.37	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	185/1546	4.91	4.40	4.32	4.40	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	384/1323	4.53	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.56	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378	4.91	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	270/ 904	4.44	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MLL 602 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1114
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	262/1670	4.85	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	301/1666	4.77	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	153/1406	4.92	4.48	4.32	4.36	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	158/1615	4.92	4.34	4.24	4.33	4.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	181/1566	4.82	4.26	4.07	4.20	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	152/1528	4.85	4.23	4.12	4.33	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	10	4.62	417/1650	4.62	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	607/1667	4.92	4.47	4.67	4.74	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	207/1626	4.78	4.08	4.11	4.20	4.78
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	202/1549	4.91	4.34	4.31	4.37	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	253/1546	4.91	4.40	4.32	4.40	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	260/1323	4.53	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.29	4.10	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	316/1378	4.83	4.56	4.29	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	281/1378	4.91	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	270/ 904	4.44	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 3 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MLL 625 0101
 Title INTER/CROSS-CULT COMMU
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1115
 AUG 6, 2008
 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	1	7	12	4.27	974/1670	4.27	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	503/1666	4.59	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	980/1406	4.13	4.48	4.32	4.36	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	944/1615	4.19	4.34	4.24	4.33	4.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	4	11	4.00	851/1566	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.20	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	8	8	4.00	899/1528	4.00	4.23	4.12	4.33	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	806/1650	4.33	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	970/1667	4.71	4.47	4.67	4.74	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	515/1626	4.44	4.08	4.11	4.20	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	0	7	11	4.47	933/1559	4.47	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	18	4.85	725/1560	4.85	4.75	4.72	4.81	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	840/1549	4.38	4.34	4.31	4.37	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	899/1546	4.35	4.40	4.32	4.40	4.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	2	5	11	4.25	545/1323	4.25	3.96	4.00	4.03	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.29	4.10	4.21	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	348/1378	4.80	4.56	4.29	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	169/1378	4.95	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	67/ 904	4.95	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.95
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.53	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.63	4.64	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.66	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.58	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00 14	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	14
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

Course-Section: MLL 695 0101
 Title INTERCULT VIDEO PROD I
 Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2008

Page 1116
 AUG 6, 2008
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	964/1670	4.29	4.36	4.31	4.46	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1350/1666	3.86	4.31	4.27	4.34	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1057/1406	4.00	4.48	4.32	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.34	4.24	4.33	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	2	0	0	2.25	1549/1566	2.25	4.26	4.07	4.20	2.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1368/1528	3.33	4.23	4.12	4.33	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1534/1650	3.29	4.16	4.22	4.30	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	1347/1667	4.29	4.47	4.67	4.74	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.08	4.11	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1280/1559	4.00	4.38	4.46	4.49	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	855/1560	4.80	4.75	4.72	4.81	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1146/1549	4.00	4.34	4.31	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1293/1546	3.75	4.40	4.32	4.40	3.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	894/1323	3.80	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	975/1384	3.80	4.29	4.10	4.21	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	718/1378	4.40	4.56	4.29	4.42	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	590/1378	4.60	4.45	4.31	4.51	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.04	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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