Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Instructor Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from 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 instructor make clear the expected goals	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 questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	27	4.79	263/1342	4.79	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected 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 readings 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 assignments 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 system clearly explained	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 was 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 grade the overall teaching 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 instructor'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 instructor 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 material 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 techniques 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 discussions 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 encouraged 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 instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	644/1269	4.50	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	23	7	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 878	****	4.19	4.05	3.91	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help 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	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	24	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	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			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MLL  218  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1085
Title        FILM & SOC IN LATIN AM        Baltimore County                            JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  WESTPHAL, GERMA               Spring 2009                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      47
Questionnaires:  22                Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                            Frequencies       Instructor   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  2  1  3  5 11  4.00 1148/1576  4.00  4.34  4.30  4.35  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  4  4  6  7  3.64 1356/1576  3.64  4.32  4.27  4.32  3.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  19  0  0  1  0  2  4.33 ****/1342  ****  4.48  4.32  4.41  ****
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
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  21  0  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  953/1434  3.95  4.22  4.14  4.06  3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  1  2  3  5 10  4.00 1041/1547  4.00  4.12  4.19  4.22  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  7 15  4.68  881/1574  4.68  4.55  4.64  4.62  4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4  0  1  0  6  8  3  3.67 1227/1554  3.67  4.13  4.10  4.05  3.67

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        8   0  3  0  4  3  4  3.36 1415/1488  3.36  4.39  4.47  4.44  3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  2  3 13  4.61 1113/1493  4.61  4.78  4.73  4.75  4.61
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 9  0  2  2  2  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  2  5  3.33 1363/1489  3.33  4.40  4.32  4.31  3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 8  1  0  0  0  1 12  4.92   84/1277  4.92  3.99  4.03  4.01  4.92

              Discussion
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 encouraged to participate 7  0  1  2  2  2  8  3.93  982/1270  3.93  4.57  4.35  4.30  3.93
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  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  0  1  5.00 ****/  72  ****  5.00  4.64  4.83  ****
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 ****/  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
  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
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  250  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1086
Title       INTRO FREN-SPEAKING WR          Baltimore County                                 JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    FIELD, THOMAS T               Spring 2009                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     34
Questionnaires: 21                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                 Frequencies       Instructor   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   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
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0   0   0   1   2  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  5.00 ****/  35  ****  5.00  4.67  5.00  ****

                           Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades           Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A   9      Required for Majors   7      Graduate      0       Major        2
28-55      3      1.00-1.99   0        B   4
56-83      1      2.00-2.99   1        C   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
                                       P   1                                  responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                 1
```

?   0

```
Course-Section: MLL  301  0101          University of Maryland                          Page 1087
Title         TEXTUAL ANALYSIS          Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   FATIH, ZAKARIA  (Instr. A) Spring 2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
Questionnaires: 15                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                               Frequencies        Instructor   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
```

```
                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1      0.00-0.99   0        A    8       Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0      Major       11
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99   0        B    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 enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                14
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  301  0101           University of Maryland                        Page 1088
Title        TEXTUAL ANALYSIS             Baltimore County                             JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:              (Instr. B)       Spring 2009                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      29
Questionnaires:  15                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   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 12 0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33  ****/1554  3.92  4.13  4.10  4.09  3.92

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        11   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1488  4.90  4.39  4.47  4.47  4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   11   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1493  4.87  4.78  4.73  4.70  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 11  0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1486  4.73  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     11   0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1489  4.77  4.40  4.32  4.34  4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 11 0  0  0  0  0  4  5.00     1/1277  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


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1      0.00-0.99    0        A    8      Required for Majors   1     Graduate      0       Major      11
  28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0        B    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 enough
                                          P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                          I    0      Other                14
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  305  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1089
Title        INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO         Baltimore County                           JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  MEDINA, ADRIANA                  Spring 2009                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      32
Questionnaires: 25                       Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                            Frequencies       Instructor   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  1  3  3  18  4.52  609/1576  4.52  4.34  4.30  4.30  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  7  16  4.56  528/1576  4.56  4.32  4.27  4.28  4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  14  0  2  1  1   7  4.18  886/1342  4.18  4.48  4.32  4.30  4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  2  4  8  11  4.12  977/1520  4.12  4.30  4.25  4.25  4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  1  2  5  16  4.50  366/1465  4.50  4.26  4.12  4.09  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  3  6  15  4.40  524/1434  4.40  4.22  4.14  4.15  4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  2  1  5  4  13  4.00 1041/1547  4.00  4.12  4.19  4.21  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 17   8  4.32 1270/1574  4.32  4.55  4.64  4.61  4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  1  2  6  12  4.38  558/1554  4.38  4.13  4.10  4.09  4.38

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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 the instructor seem interested in 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 lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  1  4  19  4.75  339/1486  4.75  4.33  4.32  4.32  4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  2  3  18  4.70  461/1489  4.70  4.40  4.32  4.34  4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  1  5  5  12  4.22  569/1277  4.22  3.99  4.03  4.11  4.22

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  1  3  16  4.75  262/1279  4.75  4.30  4.17  4.20  4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  1  18  4.95  156/1270  4.95  4.57  4.35  4.42  4.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  1  18  4.95  167/1269  4.95  4.38  4.35  4.41  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   1  0  0  0  1  17  4.94   70/ 878  4.94  4.19  4.05  4.09  4.94


                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0      A   16      Required for Majors   6     Graduate      0      Major        3
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0      B    3
  56-83     4      2.00-2.99    2      C    1      General               3     Under-grad   25      Non-major   22
  84-150    8      3.00-3.49    4      D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    5      F    0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                13
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  332  0101          University of Maryland                              Page 1090
Title        TOPICS IN GERMAN CULTU          Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  MAY, BRIGITTE                       Spring 2009                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      6
Questionnaires:  5                     Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   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                  0   1   1   0   0   0   3  4.00  464/ 878  4.00  4.19  4.05  4.09  4.00


                                        Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MLL  470  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1091
Title         L2 ACQUISITION/LEARNIN       Baltimore County                                  JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   OSKOZ, ANA                   Spring 2009                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     21
Questionnaires: 17                    Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies         Instructor   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


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0   0   0   2   4   5   6  3.88  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  11  4.53  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   1   5  3.18  1398/1486  3.18  4.33  4.32  4.41  3.18
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0   0   3   3   5   2   4  3.06  1412/1489  3.06  4.40  4.32  4.38  3.06
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  0   0   5   4   2   3   3  2.71  1212/1277  2.71  3.99  4.03  4.04  2.71


           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


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0      A   11        Required for Majors   0    Graduate      10    Major        0
  28-55     1       1.00-1.99    0      B    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
                                        P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                        I    0        Other                12
                                        ?    2
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  601  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1092
Title       INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATI               Baltimore County                               JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:   FIELD, THOMAS T                    Spring 2009                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    18
Questionnaires: 13                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                           Frequencies      Instructor   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  1  2  3  7  4.23  976/1576  4.23  4.34  4.30  4.43  4.23
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  6  7  4.54  568/1576  4.54  4.32  4.27  4.32  4.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  286/1342  4.77  4.48  4.32  4.38  4.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  7  5  4.31  805/1520  4.31  4.30  4.25  4.36  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  4  7  4.31  596/1465  4.31  4.26  4.12  4.25  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  6  6  4.50  398/1434  4.50  4.22  4.14  4.35  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  2  2  9  4.54  492/1547  4.54  4.12  4.19  4.24  4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  8  5  4.38 1219/1574  4.38  4.55  4.64  4.75  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1  0  1  4  6  4.17  805/1554  4.17  4.13  4.10  4.18  4.17


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/1488  5.00  4.39  4.47  4.52  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested 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 lecture material presented and explained 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 lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  1  0  4  8  4.46  742/1489  4.46  4.40  4.32  4.38  4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 1  2  0  2  6  2  3.50 1020/1277  3.50  3.99  4.03  4.08  3.50


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  2  5  6  4.31  625/1279  4.31  4.30  4.17  4.34  4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  1  0  2 10  4.62  550/1270  4.62  4.57  4.35  4.53  4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0  0  0  2 11  4.85  342/1269  4.85  4.38  4.35  4.55  4.85
4. Were special techniques successful                  0  2  0  0  0  7  4  4.36  305/ 878  4.36  4.19  4.05  4.11  4.36


            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 12 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  85  ****  4.67  4.72  4.79  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 12 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.67  4.69  4.77  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 12 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  72  ****  5.00  4.64  4.70  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    12  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  5.00  4.61  4.70  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 0  0  0  0  0  1 12  4.92  109/ 375  4.92  4.97  4.01  4.10  4.92


            Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities  0  0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/ 326  5.00  4.99  4.03  4.10  5.00


            Self  Paced
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students      0  0  0  0  0  0 13  5.00    1/ 382  5.00  4.99  4.08  4.13  5.00


                               Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons            Type             Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     5       0.00-0.99    0      A   11       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               1    Under-grad   7    Non-major   13
  84-150    0       3.00-3.49    1      D    0
  Grad.     6       3.50-4.00    7      F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                11
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  602  0101              University of Maryland                                       Page 1093
Title          ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC          Baltimore County                                         JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    STOLLE-MCALLIST (Instr. A)      Spring 2009                                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      17
Questionnaires:  15                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                              Frequencies         Instructor   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   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  11  4.67  468/1486  4.53  4.33  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   6  4.15  615/1277  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

           Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14   0   0   0   0   0   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  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  5.00  ****/  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  4.03  4.10  5.00

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  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  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
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  602  0101                    University of Maryland                         Page 1093
Title          ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC              Baltimore County                              JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:    STOLLE-MCALLIST (Instr. A)          Spring 2009                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    17
Questionnaires: 15                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected 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       B     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
                                          P     0                                    responses to be significant
                                          I     0        Other                13
                                          ?     0
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  602  0101            University of Maryland                                    Page 1094
Title        ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC         Baltimore County                                       JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  KA, OMAR      (Instr. B)       Spring 2009                                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     17
Questionnaires: 15                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies          Instructor   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   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  4.90   557/1493  4.95  4.78  4.73  4.80  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5   0   0   0   1   4   5  4.40   821/1486  4.53  4.33  4.32  4.37  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      6   0   0   1   1   3   4  4.11  1057/1489  4.23  4.40  4.32  4.38  4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5  2   0   0   2   2   4  4.25   533/1277  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

           Laboratory
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           14   0   0   0   0   0   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  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  5.00  ****/  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  4.03  4.10  5.00

           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 14  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00  ****/  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  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
```

Title   ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC   Baltimore County   JUL 2, 2009
Instructor: KA, OMAR   (Instr. B)   Spring 2009   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 15   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                                      Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected 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   B   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
                                           P   0   responses to be significant
                                           I   0   Other   13
                                           ?   0

```
Course-Section: MLL  625  0101              University of Maryland                                    Page 1095
Title      INTER/CROSS-CULT COMMU              Baltimore County                                       JUL  2, 2009
Instructor:  MEDINA, ADRIANA                      Spring 2009                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     26
Questionnaires:  21                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies        Instructor   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   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   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  12   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     0   1   0   1   3   5  11  4.30   805/1520   4.30  4.30  4.25  4.36  4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 the grading system clearly explained             0   2   0   0   5   5   9  4.21   882/1547   4.21  4.12  4.19  4.24  4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   9  12  4.57  1025/1574   4.57  4.55  4.64  4.75  4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 7 0   0   0   2   7   5  4.21   752/1554   4.21  4.13  4.10  4.18  4.21


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures 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    1   0   0   0   0   1  19  4.95   334/1493   4.95  4.78  4.73  4.80  4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   1   2   2  13  4.50   678/1486   4.50  4.33  4.32  4.37  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   0   1   2   2  13  4.50   696/1489   4.50  4.40  4.32  4.38  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  3   1   0   2   5   8  4.19   593/1277   4.19  3.99  4.03  4.08  4.19


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute 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
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0   0   0   0   2  17  4.89   269/1270   4.89  4.57  4.35  4.53  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0   0   0   0   1  18  4.95   167/1269   4.95  4.38  4.35  4.55  4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   0   0   0   1   4  14  4.68   156/ 878   4.68  4.19  4.05  4.11  4.68


                                 Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected 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      B    2
  56-83      0       2.00-2.99   0      C    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
                                       P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other               10
                                       ?    0
```

| | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | 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	1	0	0	3	4.25	952/1576	4.25	4.34	4.30	4.43	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	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	2	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	1	0	0	2	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute 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 written assignments contribute 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 grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.55	4.64	4.75	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1166/1554	3.75	4.13	4.10	4.18	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1355/1493	4.25	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	955/1489	4.25	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	159/1277	4.75	3.99	4.03	4.08	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.30	4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	535/1269	4.67	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	671/ 878	3.67	4.19	4.05	4.11	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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