Course-Section: MLL 191 0101 Title

THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE Baltimore County Spring 2009

Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY

Enrollment: 96 Questionnaires: 33

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 1084 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						equer				Inst	tructor	Course	_			
	Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General															
1. Did you gain new		om this course	0	0	1	0	6	8	18	4.27	928/1576	4.27	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.27
2. Did the instructo			0	0	0	1	2	8	22	4.55	555/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.55
3. Did the exam ques			0	0	0	0	1		27	4.79	263/1342	4.79	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.79
4. Did other evaluat	ions reflect the e	xpected goals	0	20	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	239/1520	4.77	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.77
5. Did assigned read	lings contribute to	what you learned	0	1	2	2	5	7	16	4.03	834/1465	4.03	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.03
6. Did written assig	nments contribute	to what you learned	0	23	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	151/1434	4.80	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.80
7. Was the grading s	system clearly expl	ained	0	0	0	0	3	5	25	4.67	339/1547	4.67	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.67
8. How many times wa	s class cancelled		0	1	0	1	9	17	5	3.81	1535/1574	3.81	4.55	4.64	4.59	3.81
9. How would you gra	de the overall tea	ching effectiveness	9	1	1	1	5	6	10	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.00
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruct	or's lectures well	prepared	1	0	0	0	6	8	18	4.38	1018/1488	4.38	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.38
2. Did the instructo	or seem interested	in the subject	1	0	0	0	3	2	27	4.75	908/1493	4.75	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.75
3. Was lecture mater	rial presented and	explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	8	18	4.34	881/1486	4.34	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.34
4. Did the lectures	contribute to what	you learned	1	1	1	1	4	4	21	4.39	834/1489	4.39	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.39
5. Did audiovisual t	echniques enhance	your understanding	1	0	1	3	3	12	13	4.03	680/1277	4.03	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.03
	Discussion															
1. Did class discuss	sions contribute to	what you learned	23	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	938/1279	3.80	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.80
2. Were all students	actively encourag	ed to participate	23	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	736/1270	4.40	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.40
3. Did the instructo	or encourage fair a	nd open discussion	23	0	0	1	0	2		4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.50
4. Were special tech	niques successful		23	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	***	4.19	4.05	3.91	****
	Field Work															
5. Did conferences h	melp you carry out	field activities	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.99	4.03	3.64	****
	Self Paced															
5. Were there enough	proctors for all	the students	27	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	3.86	****
		Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utior	ı									
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	;

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	24	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	33	Non-major	32
84-150	12	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	=			
				2	1						

Title FILM & SOC IN LATIN AM

Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA

Enrollment: 47

Questionnaires: 22

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1085 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

University of Maryland

Object 1			Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	e Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor skee clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. 21 D 0 0 0 1 1 0 2 4.33 ****/1342 ***** 4.48 4.32 4.41 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 8. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 9. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 3. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding ship in the subject ship in t			Genera	 1															
2. Did the instructors make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 4 4 6 6 7 3.64 1366/1876 3.64 4.32 4.27 4.32 3.64 3.04 the sexan questions reflect the expected goals 0 1 9 0 0 1 1 0 2 4.38 ***1/342 **** 4.46 4.32 4.41 **** 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 2 0 1 1 0 0 6 3.05 116/1850 3.95 4.30 4.25 4.26 3.95 5.01 dassignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 0 1 1 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/1465 **** 4.26 4.12 4.09 **** 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 0 4 4 9 3.95 953/143 3.95 4.22 4.14 4.06 3.95 7.80 Among class contended 1 0 1 2 0 6 8 3 3.67 1227/1554 3.67 4.22 4.14 4.06 3.95 7.80 Among class contended 1 0 1 2 0 6 8 3 3.67 1227/1554 3.67 4.13 4.10 4.05 3.67 8.80 Among class contended 1 0 1 0 6 8 8 3 3.67 1227/1554 3.67 4.13 4.10 4.05 3.67 8.80 Among class contended 1 0 1 0 0 0 7 1 15 4.00 Among class contended 1 0 0 0 0 2 2 3 13 4.61 1137/1493 4.61 4.07 4.05 3.67 8.80 Among class contended 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Did yo	u gain ne			m this course	0	0	2	1	3	5	11	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 3 2 0 1 10 6 3.95 1116/1520 3.95 4.30 4.25 4.26 3.95 bid assignment examing contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 0 0 0 0 1 3.95 3.95 3136/1434 3.95 4.12 4.09 4.95 4.06 1.00 with the contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 0 0 4 4 9 3.55 953/1434 3.95 4.22 4.14 4.06 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 1 2 3 5 10 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.12 4.19 4.22 4.00 8. How wantly fines was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 15 4.68 881/1574 4.68 4.55 4.64 4.62 4.68 8.00 8. How wantly dour grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 0 0 0 7 15 4.68 881/1574 4.68 4.55 4.64 4.62 4.68 8.00 8.00 8. How wantly dour grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 13 4.61 1133/1439 4.61 4.07 4.74 4.44 3.66 2.00 8. How wantly dour grade the explained 8 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0						0	0	1	4	4	6	7	3.64	1356/1576	3.64	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned of 21 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/465 **** 4.26 4.12 4.09 ***** 5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned of 3 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/465 **** 4.26 4.14 4.06 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 3 5 10 4.00 1041/547 4.00 4.12 4.14 4.06 3.95 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 15 4.68 881/1574 4.00 4.12 4.19 4.22 4.08 8.89 8.80 would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 1 0 0 6 8 3 3.67 1227/1554 3.67 4.13 4.10 4.05 3.67 1227/1554 3.67 4.13 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.10	3. Did th	e exam qu	estions reflec	t the ex	kpected goals	0	19	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1342	****	4.48	4.32	4.41	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 3 2 0 4 4 9 3.95 93/1444 3.95 4.22 4.14 4.06 3.95	4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	3	2	0	1	10	6	3.95	1116/1520	3.95	4.30	4.25	4.26	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 1 2 3 5 10 4.00 1041/1547 4.00 4.12 4.19 4.22 4.00 8.80 How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 1 8.08 881/1574 4.68 48.62 4.68 9.80 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 7 1 8.08 881/1574 4.68 4.65 4.64 4.62 4.68 9.80 How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 3 3 3.067 1227/1554 3.67 4.13 4.10 4.05 3.67 Each would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 13 3.067 1227/1554 3.67 4.13 4.10 4.05 3.67 Each would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 2 3 13 3.067 1227/1554 3.67 4.13 4.10 4.05 3.67 Each would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 13 3 3.067 1227/1554 3.67 4.13 4.10 4.05 3.67 Each would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 13 3 3.067 1227/1554 3.67 4.13 4.13 4.33 4.23 4.23 4.33 4.34 4.33 4.35 4.29 3.54 4.34 4.34 4.34 4.34 4.34 4.34 4.34	5. Did as	signed re	adings contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	0	21	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1465	****	4.26	4.12	4.09	****
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How mould you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8						0	-		-	_	_	9	3.95	953/1434	3.95	4.22	4.14	4.06	3.95
Note the instructor's lectures well prepared			-		ined							10	4.00	1041/1547		4.12	4.19	4.22	4.00
Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Lecture Record Reco		-					-	-	-	-									
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overa	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	4	0	1	0	6	8	3	3.67	1227/1554	1 3.67	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject			Lectur	е															
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9 0 2 2 2 1 1 6 3.54 1323/1486 3.54 4.33 4.32 4.29 3.54 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 6 1 2 3 3 3 1363/1489 3.33 4.40 4.32 4.31 3.33 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 12 4.92 84/1277 4.92 3.99 4.03 4.01 4.92 **Discussion** **Discussion** **Discussion** **Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 2 0 2 5 6 3.87 914/1279 3.87 4.30 4.17 4.14 3.87 **Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 2 2 2 2 8 8 3.93 982/1270 3.93 4.57 4.35 4.30 3.93 **Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1 0 2 0 2 3 6 3.47 1126/1269 3.47 4.38 4.35 4.29 3.47 **Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	prepared	8	0	3	0	4	3	4	3.36	1415/1488	3.36	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	4	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	1113/1493	3 4.61	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.61
Discussion						9	0			2		6	3.54	1323/1486	3.54	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.54
Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 2 0 2 5 6 3.87 914/1279 3.87 4.30 4.17 4.14 3.87 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 2 2 2 2 8 3.93 982/1270 3.93 4.57 4.35 4.30 3.93 .Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 4 0 2 3 6 3.47 1126/1269 3.47 4.38 4.35 4.29 3.47 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 240 **** 5.00 4.35 4.47 **** Seminar Seminar Mere assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.67 4.72 4.78 **** Seminar Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.67 4.72 4.78 **** Mas the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.69 4.72 **** Did greearch projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 79 **** 5.00 4.64 4.83 **** Eyeld Work Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.83 **** Field Work Did greearch your greateness contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.49 4.71 **** Eyeld Work Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.40 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 22-55-55 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 5 5 5 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 5 5 5 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5					•									1363/1489	3.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	3.33
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 2 0 2 5 6 3.87 914/1279 3.87 4.30 4.17 4.14 3.87 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 4 0 2 3 6 3.47 1126/1269 3.47 4.38 4.35 4.29 3.47 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 240 *** 5.00 4.35 4.47 **** Laboratory 2	5. Did au	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	8	1	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	84/1277	7 4.92	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 1 2 2 2 2 8 8 3.93 982/1270 3.93 4.57 4.35 4.30 3.93 3.00 the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 1 2 2 2 2 8 8 3.93 982/1270 3.93 4.57 4.38 4.35 4.29 3.47 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 240 **** 5.00 4.35 4.47 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.67 4.72 4.78 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.67 4.72 4.78 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.67 4.72 4.78 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.80 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.64 4.81 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Discus	sion															
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 4 0 2 3 6 3.47 1126/1269 3.47 4.38 4.35 4.29 3.47 Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 240 **** 5.00 4.35 4.47 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.67 4.72 4.78 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.67 4.79 4.72 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.67 4.69 4.72 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.80 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.80 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 *** 4.97 4.01 4.21 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to 1	what you learned	7	0	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	914/1279	3.87	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.87
Laboratory 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 21 0 1 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 240 **** 5.00 4.35 4.47 **** Seminar	2. Were a	ll studen	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	7	0	1	2	2	2	8	3.93	982/1270	3.93	4.57	4.35	4.30	3.93
Seminar Semi	3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	7	0	4	0	2	3	6	3.47	1126/1269	3.47	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.47
Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 **** 85 **** 4.67 4.72 4.78 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 79 **** 4.67 4.67 4.72 4.78 **** 4.83 **** 4.85 **** 4.67 4.69 4.72 **** 4.83 **** 4.85 **** 4.85 4.67 4.69 4.72 **** 4.85			Labora	tory															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 85 **** 4.67 4.72 4.78 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.69 4.72 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 4.67 4.69 4.72 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.80 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.97 4.01 4.21 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.40 4.71 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 5 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 5-683 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 0 Gradu 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Gradu 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	2. Were y	ou provid	led with adequa	te back	ground information	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.47	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 79 **** 4.67 4.69 4.72 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.83 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.80 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.97 4.01 4.21 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 100 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 5 5 56-83 1 2.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 Credits Earned Distribution The contribute to what you learned 21 0 Other 4																			
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 72 **** 5.00 4.64 4.83 **** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.80 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.97 4.01 4.21 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.40 4.71 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 0 Canada 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant 1 0 Other 4		-	-							-		_		,					
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 80 **** 5.00 4.61 4.80 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 375 **** 4.97 4.01 4.21 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.40 4.71 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other							-	-		-		-		, .					
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.40 4.71 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.40 4.71 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Gradu. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		_	-		_		-	-			-	_							
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.40 4.71 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 5 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					you learned			-			-	-		,					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.74 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.40 4.71 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 0 Graduate 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 4	5. Were c	riteria I	or grading mad	e clear		21	0	0	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	****/ 375	****	4.97	4.01	4.21	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 21 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 48 **** 5.00 4.40 4.71 **** Self Paced																			
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4												-		,	-				****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 5.00 4.60 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 5 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	2. Did yo	u clearly	understand yo	ur evalı	uation criteria	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	3 ****	5.00	4.40	4.71	****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors			Self	Paced															
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 Required for Majors 10 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 5 1.00-1.99 0 B 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Electives 0 0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant P 0 0 Other 4	1. Did se	elf-paced	system contrib	ute to v	what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
00-27					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
28-55	Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	<i>т</i> ре			Majors	
28-55																			
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 3 C 0 General 5 Under-grad 22 Non-major 22 84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant		-		-			Red	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajor	s l	U	Graduat	e	U	Мајс	r	U
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 I 0 Other 4							C.	no	1				E	IIndon -	rrad '	2.2	Nor	mo dosc	2.2
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4							Gel	nera.	т				ن	onder-9	jiau .	۵۷	MO11-	ıııa Jor	22
I 0 Other 4					F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	h
	P 0												respons	ses to l	oe sigr	nificar	ıt		
		I 0					Otl	her					4						

?

1

Title INTRO FREN-SPEAKING WR

Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T

Enrollment: 34 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 1086 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	485/1576	4.62	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	8	12	4.48	653/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	197/1342	4.88	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	14	4.57	429/1520	4.57	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	184/1434	4.76	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	351/1547	4.65	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	6	4.29	1302/1574	4.29	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	149/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	557/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	378/1489	4.75	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	1	18	4.80	132/1277	4.80	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.80
Discussion	_	0	•	0	-	_	1.0	4 50	000/1000	4 50	4 20	4 1 1	4 1 4	4 50
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1		12	4.73	279/1279	4.73	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	612/1270	4.53	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	321/1269	4.87	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	2	1	1	5	5	3.71	654/ 878	3.71	4.19	4.05	3.92	3.71
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	***	5.00	4.35	4.47	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.78	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.72	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 375	****	4.97	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.74	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.71	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
J. Mere your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	_	U	U	U	U	_	5.00	, 33		3.00	1.07	3.00	
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Frequency	Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	С	0	General	3	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				Т	0	Other	1	-		_	

? 0

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101 University of Maryland
Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS Baltimore County

Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS Baltimore Count Instructor: FATIH, ZAKARIA (Instr. A) Spring 2009

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1087

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	2	2	1	10	4.27	940/1576	4.27	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	709/1342	4.40	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	961/1465	3.93	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	727/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	1046/1554	3.92	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	401/1488	4.90	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	947/1493	4.87	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	735/1486	4.73	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	660/1489	4.77	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	132/1277	4.90	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	258/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.44
<u>.</u>									,					

Frequency Distribution

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	14	_			
				2	1						

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101 University of Maryland Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS Baltimore County

Instructor: (Instr. B)

Grad.

0

3.50-4.00

Ρ

I

?

0

0

1

Spring 2009

Page 1088 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Enrollment:	29	
Questionnaires:	15	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	nı gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	2	2	1	10	4.27	940/1576	4.27	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.27
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	759/1576	4.40	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.40
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	709/1342	4.40	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.40
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	339/1520	4.67	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.67
				what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	3	7	3.93	961/1465	3.93	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.93
	_	-		to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	727/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.21
		g system clearl		-	1	0	0	0	3	0	11	4.57	, -	4.57	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.57
		was class canc			1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	567/1574	4.86	4.55	4.64	4.61	
	-			ching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	2	1		****/1554			4.10	4.09	3.92
		Lectur	٩															
1 Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture		prepared	11	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	4.90	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.90
		ctor seem inter			11	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1493	4.87	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.87
				explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1486	4.73	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.73
		es contribute t			11	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1489	4.77	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.77
				your understanding	11	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1277	4.90	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.90
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	lass disc			what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.78
				ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.42	5.00
		-	_	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.67
		echniques succe		•	6	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	258/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.44
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
				_														
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s:	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 5														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.5	Non-	-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														

Electives

14

Other

Course-Section: MLL 305 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO

Baltimore County

Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1089

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fre	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
1 511		Genera	_		0	0	0	-	_	_	1.0	4 50	600/1556	4 50	4 2 4	4 20	4 20	4 50
		ew insights,ski			0	0	0	Ţ	3	3	18	4.52	609/1576	4.52	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.52
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.56	528/1576	4.56	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.56
		uestions reflec			0	14 0	0	2	1	Τ	11	4.18	886/1342	4.18	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.18
		uations reflect		1 0	0	0	0	2 1	4	8	11	4.12		4.12	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.12
	-	-		what you learned	1	•	•	_	2	5	16	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.50
		_		o what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.40
		g system clearly		ined	0	0	2	1	5	4	13		1041/1547	4.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.00
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	17	8		1270/1574		4.55	4.64	4.61	4.32
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	0	0	1	2	6	12	4.38	558/1554	4.38	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.38
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	19	4.71	610/1488	4.71	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.71
2. Did th	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	339/1486	4.75	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.75
		es contribute to			2	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	461/1489	4.70	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.70
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	1	0	1	5	5	12	4.22	569/1277	4.22	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.22
		Discus																
1 Did al	aga diga			what you learned	_	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.75
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.75	156/1270	4.75	4.57	4.17	4.42	4.75
				d to participate d open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	167/1269	4.95	4.38	4.35	4.42	4.95
		_		d open discussion	6	1	0	0	0	1	17	4.93	70/ 878	4.93	4.19	4.05	4.41	4.95
4. were s	рестат с	echniques succe	SSLUI		ь	Τ	U	U	U	Τ	1/	4.94	70/ 8/8	4.94	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.94
				Frequ	ency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;
														- 				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 16		Red	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	S	6	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 3				_									_	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Gei	nera	1				3	Under-g	rad 2	5	Non-	major	22
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1				_	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Ot1	her				1	.3						

?

0

Course-Section: MLL 332 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN GERMAN CULTU Baltimore County

Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE Spring 2009

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1090

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	5	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.30	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.09	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1537/1574	3.80	4.55	4.64	4.61	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	309/1277	4.50	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	584/1269	4.60	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful			1	0	0	0	3	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.00
Theo are			i lo-		_									

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 470 0101 University of Maryland Title L2 ACQUISITION/LEARNIN

Baltimore County Spring 2009

OSKOZ, ANA Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 17

Page 1091 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Cours	e Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------------	--------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	2	3	10	4.38	818/1576	4.38	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	2	5	3.41	1433/1576	3.41	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.41
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.48	4.32	4.46	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	4	5	3.53	1355/1520	3.53	4.30	4.25	4.38	3.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	4	1	8	3.76	1095/1465	3.76	4.26	4.12	4.22	3.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	953/1434	3.94	4.22	4.14	4.30	3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	4	6	3.76	1235/1547	3.76	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	881/1574	4.69	4.55	4.64	4.69	4.69
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	4	4	4	1	2.87	1491/1554	2.87	4.13	4.10	4.24	2.87
T t														
Lecture	0	0	^	_	4	_	_	2 00	1201/1400	2 00	4 20	4 47	4 55	2 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	5	11		1321/1488	3.88	4.39	4.47	4.55	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	5	TT		1193/1493	4.53	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	4	5	Τ.	5 4		1398/1486 1412/1489	3.18	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	5	3 1	2	∠ 3	3		1212/1277	2.71	3.99	4.32	4.38	3.06 2.71
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	5	4	2	3	3	2./1	1212/12//	2./1	3.99	4.03	4.04	2./1
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	7	4	4	3.59	1030/1279	3.59	4.30	4.17	4.31	3.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	865/1270	4.18	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	5	3	7	3.88	997/1269	3.88	4.38	4.35	4.55	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	5	6	5	4.00	464/ 878	4.00	4.19	4.05	4.33	4.00
Freq	iencv	Dist	ribu	ıtior	1									
	2													

Credits E	Carned	Cum. GP	A	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	10	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	7	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	10	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	2						

Title INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATI

Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13

18

Baltimore County
Spring 2009

JUL 2, 2009
Job IRBR3029

Page 1092

Student	Course	Evaluation	. Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	-----------------

University of Maryland

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General						_			_							
		insights, skil			0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	976/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.43	4.23
		r make clear	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	568/1576	4.54	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.54
	_	tions reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	286/1342	4.77	4.48	4.32	4.38	4.77
		ions reflect	_	-	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	805/1520	4.31	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.31
				at you learned	0	0	•	1	1	4	7	4.31	596/1465	4.31	4.26	4.12	4.25	4.31
	_			what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	4.35	4.50
_	_	ystem clearly	_	ea	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	492/1547	4.54	4.12	4.19	4.24	4.54
_		s class cance			0	0	0	0	0 1	8	5		1219/1574	4.38	4.55	4.64	4.75	4.38
9. How would	ı you gra	de the overa.	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	1	0	1	U	1	4	6	4.17	805/1554	4.17	4.13	4.10	4.18	4.17
		Lecture	9															
1. Were the	instruct	or's lectures	s well pr	epared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.52	5.00
2. Did the i	nstructo	r seem inter	ested in	the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.92	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.92
3. Was lectu	re mater	ial presented	d and exp	lained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	325/1486	4.77	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.77
4. Did the l	ectures	contribute to	what yo	u learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	742/1489	4.46	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.46
5. Did audio	visual t	echniques enl	nance you	r understanding	0	1	2	0	2	6	2	3.50	1020/1277	3.50	3.99	4.03	4.08	3.50
		Discus								_	_							
		at you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	625/1279	4.31	4.30	4.17	4.34	4.31		
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate							1	0	2	10	4.62	550/1270	4.62	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.62
	the instructor encourage fair and open discussion special techniques successful						0	0	0	2	11	4.85	342/1269	4.85	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.85
4. Were spec	lal tech	niques succes	sstul		0	2	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	305/ 878	4.36	4.19	4.05	4.11	4.36
		Semina	2															
1. Were assi	aned top	ics relevant	to the a	nnounced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.79	****
				idual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.77	****
				at you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	****
		contribute t		-	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	****
_		grading made	_		0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	109/ 375	4.92	4.97	4.01	4.10	4.92
		Field V																
5. Did confe	erences h	elp you carry	y out fie	ld activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.10	5.00
		Self I	banes															
5. Were ther	e enough	proctors for		students	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.13	5.00
J. MOI G GIIGI	.c circugi	FIGOROID IO	. 411 0110	5 caaciros	Ü	Ü	Ū	Ü	Ü	Ü		5.00	1, 302	3.00	1.,,,	1.00	1.15	3.00
	Fr						ribu	ution	ı									
Credits Earn	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons				Туј	ne .			Majors	
											,							
00-27							quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	0	Graduat	9	6	Majo	r	0
28-55																		
56-83						Ger	neral	L				1	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	13
84-150																		
Grad. 6 3.50-4.00 7 F 0						$El\epsilon$	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - I				_	h
P 0						Oth							response	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	I 0										1	1						
	I 0 ? 1																	

ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC

Title Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 17

Baltimore County Spring 2009

University of Maryland

Page 1093 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires: 15 Student Course Evaluation Questionna	Questionnaires:
---	-----------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	3	12	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	812/1342	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.38	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	579/1520	4.47	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	424/1465	4.47	4.26	4.12	4.25	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	592/1547	4.47	4.12	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.93	4.55	4.64	4.75	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	477/1554	4.39	4.13	4.10	4.18	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	666/1488	4.53	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	4.95	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3		4.67	468/1486	4.53		4.32	4.37	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	867/1489	4.23	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	1	5		4.15	615/1277		3.99			4.20
J. Did addiovisual techniques emiance your understanding		1	1	U	_	J	U	1.13	013/12//	4.20	3.99	4.03	1.00	1.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.30	4.17	4.34	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	208/1270	4.93	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	420/ 878	4.15	4.19	4.05	4.11	4.15
Laboratory														
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.47	****
1. Did the lab imperator provide approximet		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	, 232		3.00	1.25	1.17	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.10	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99		4.10	5.00
or and contactions help for early out field aboutions	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ū		3.00	1, 320	3.00	1.,,,	1.05	1.10	3.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.13	5.00

Title ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC

Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1093 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	 10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				?	0						

ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC

Title

Instructor: KA, OMAR

Questionnaires: 15

Enrollment:

17

(Instr. B)

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1094 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	3	12	4.80	243/1576	4.80	4.34	4.30	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	812/1342	4.29	4.48	4.32	4.38	4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	579/1520	4.47	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	424/1465	4.47	4.26	4.12	4.25	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	592/1547	4.47	4.12	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	328/1574	4.93	4.55	4.64	4.75	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	623/1554	4.39	4.13	4.10	4.18	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	995/1488	4.53	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.40	557/1493	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.80	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	1	4	-	4.40	821/1486	4.53		4.73	4.37	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5 6	0	0	1	1	3	4		1057/1489		4.33	4.32	4.37	4.53
	5	2	0	0	2	2		4.11	533/1277	4.23	3.99			4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	U	U	2	2	4	4.25	533/12//	4.20	3.99	4.03	4.08	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.30	4.17	4.34	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	208/1270	4.93	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	1	0	4	7	4.15	420/ 878	4.15	4.19	4.05	4.11	4.15
T aleana kanna														
Laboratory	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	++++/ 222	****	г оо	4 00	4 47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	U	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 232		5.00	4.29	4.47	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.79	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.77	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.70	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.70	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.10	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.40	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.76	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.88	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7.4	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99		4.10	5.00
J. Dia conferences help you early out freta activities	U	U	J	J	J	J	± J	5.00	1/ 520	5.00	1.00	1.03	1.10	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.80	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.33	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.13	5.00

ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC

Title Instructor: KA, OMAR

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 15 (Instr. B)

Spring 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	ed Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-		_	
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1094 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: MLL 625 0101 University of Maryland INTER/CROSS-CULT COMMU Baltimore County

Title Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA Spring 2009

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1095

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did y	you gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	415/1576	4.67	4.34	4.30	4.43	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	728/1576	4.43	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	1	1	1	6	4.33	770/1342	4.33	4.48	4.32	4.38	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						1	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	805/1520	4.30	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.30
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	5	14	4.48	410/1465	4.48	4.26	4.12	4.25	4.48
6. Did v	written as:	signments contr	ibute	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	383/1434	4.52	4.22	4.14	4.35	4.52
7. Was t	the grading	g system clearl	y expl	ained	0	2	0	0	5	5	9	4.21	882/1547	4.21	4.12	4.19	4.24	4.21
8. How r	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	9	12	4.57	1025/1574	4.57	4.55	4.64	4.75	4.57
9. How v	would you	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	752/1554	4.21	4.13	4.10	4.18	4.21
		Lectur	e															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	0	0	4	14	4.58	786/1488	4.58	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	334/1493	4.95	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.95
3. Was I	lecture ma	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.50
		es contribute t			3	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.50
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance	your understanding	2	3	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	593/1277	4.19	3.99	4.03	4.08	4.19
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	400/1279	4.58	4.30	4.17	4.34	4.58
				ed to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	269/1270	4.89	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.89
				nd open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	167/1269	4.95	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.95
		echniques succe		-	2	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	156/ 878	4.68	4.19	4.05	4.11	4.68
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
a 1'.													_					
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re:	asons	3 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	3
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A 17		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s	1	Graduat	е	8	Majo	or	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2														10
56-83	Λ	2 00_2 00	Λ	C 0	Ceneral							7	IIndox-a	rad 13		Mon	Non-major	

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expecte	ed Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A	17	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	8	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	7	Under-grad	13	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
			P 0				responses to	be sig	gnificant		
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 695 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERCULT VIDEO PROD I

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1096

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL Enrollment: 6 Ouestionnaires: 4 Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Grad.

1

3.50-4.00

Queberennarres	-	Doddono	004100	_,	Queberonna.

						Frequencies							ructor	Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General																		
1. Did you	u gain ne	w insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.43	4.25
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	939/1576	4.25	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals							0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals							0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1317/1465	3.33	4.26	4.12	4.25	3.33
6. Did wri	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1427/1434	2.33	4.22	4.14	4.35	2.33
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla	ained	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How mar	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.75	4.50
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1166/1554	3.75	4.13	4.10	4.18	3.75
1. Were th	he instru	Lecture actor's lectures		prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	1	1	2		1355/1493	4.25	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	1	0	1	2		1101/1486		4.33	4.32	4.37	4.00
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	3.99	4.03	4.08	4.75
		Discus	ni on															
1 Did ala	acc dican			what wou learned	1	0	0	1	Λ	0	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.30	4.17	4.34	4.00
	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.67
				nd open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2		535/1269	4.67	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.67
		chniques succes		ia open arbeabbion	1	0	1	0	0	0	2		671/ 878	3.67	4.19	4.05	4.11	
				The a series			10 .											
				Frequ	lency	DIST	ribi	ltlor	1									
Credits Ea	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades							Rea	asons	5			Type				Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Rec	uire	ed fo	or Ma	 ajors		0 Gradua		 te 1		Major		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 0						-						_		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				4	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														

Electives

0

Other

0

0

0

Ρ

Ι