```
Course-Section: MLL  190  01                University of Maryland                          Page  968
Title          The World Of Language        Baltimore County                               JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Westphal,German              Spring 2010                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    49
Questionnaires: 24                  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  1  1  6 10  6  3.79 1241/1447  3.79  4.31  4.31  4.18  3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  2  0  7  7  8  3.79 1213/1447  3.79  4.34  4.27  4.30  3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  3  0  7  6  8  3.67 1096/1241  3.67  4.48  4.33  4.25  3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  1  1  3 11  7  3.96 1026/1402  3.96  4.36  4.24  4.15  3.96
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  2  6  7  8  3.91  905/1358  3.91  4.26  4.11  4.03  3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 2 2  6  7  5  3.50 1134/1316  3.50  4.27  4.14  3.99  3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  3  6 14  4.48  500/1427  4.48  4.21  4.19  4.24  4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  0  8 14  4.64  988/1447  4.64  4.66  4.69  4.68  4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 2 3  5  7  4  3.38 1281/1434  3.38  4.12  4.10  4.10  3.38


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  1  2  2  8  8  3.95 1202/1387  3.95  4.45  4.46  4.46  3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0  1  0  2  8 10  4.24 1268/1387  4.24  4.78  4.73  4.71  4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  2  0  5  8  5  3.70 1209/1386  3.70  4.35  4.32  4.32  3.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0  1  1  1  6 10  4.21  924/1380  4.21  4.43  4.32  4.31  4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 3 2  0  2  6  5  3.80  813/1193  3.80  4.02  4.02  3.99  3.80


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 15 0 1  1  2  3  2  3.44 1014/1172  3.44  4.26  4.15  3.95  3.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 15 0 0  1  1  2  5  4.22  750/1182  4.22  4.56  4.35  4.18  4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 15 0 2 1  1  3  2  3.22 1121/1170  3.22  4.41  4.38  4.17  3.22
4. Were special techniques successful                  15   7  1  0  0  1  0  2.50 ****/ 800  ****  4.17  4.06  3.95  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0        A   5      Required for Majors  9     Graduate    0      Major       2
28-55      3      1.00-1.99   0        B   9                                Under-grad  24      Non-major  22
56-83      3      2.00-2.99   1        C   7      General              6
84-150     3      3.00-3.49   4        D   0
Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   4        F   0      Electives            3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                1
                                       ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  191  01                   University of Maryland                              Page  969
Title          The World Of Language              Baltimore County                               JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    McCray,Stanley                       Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    82
Questionnaires: 23                      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	5	6	10	4.14	980/1447	4.14	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	436/1447	4.59	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	177/1241	4.86	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.86
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	15	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	13	4.27	590/1358	4.27	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	15	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	476/1316	4.43	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	5	17	4.77	181/1427	4.77	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	16	4	4.09	1334/1447	4.09	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.09
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	9	8	4.39	478/1434	4.39	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	7	14	4.59	670/1387	4.59	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.59
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	9	12	4.45	677/1386	4.45	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	615/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	796/1193	3.83	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	666/1172	4.11	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	15	5	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.17	4.06	3.95	****

```
                                       Frequency Distribution
```

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	21	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	20
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: MLL  205  01                University of Maryland                           Page  970
Title          Great Books: French              Baltimore County                          JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Fatih,Zakaria                    Spring 2010                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    20
Questionnaires: 12                     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  6  6  4.50   585/1447  4.50 4.31  4.31 4.31  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  8  3  4.17   938/1447  4.17 4.34  4.27 4.23  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   2  0  0  1  3  6  4.50   541/1241  4.50 4.48  4.33 4.35  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  1  6  4  4.27   745/1402  4.27 4.36  4.24 4.24  4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92    78/1358  4.92 4.26  4.11 4.12  4.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50   392/1316  4.50 4.27  4.14 4.08  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58   361/1427  4.58 4.21  4.19 4.14  4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  7  5  4.42  1147/1447  4.42 4.66  4.69 4.70  4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  1  8  0  3.89   996/1434  3.89 4.12  4.10 3.97  3.89


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  6  6  4.50   798/1387  4.50 4.45  4.46 4.42  4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92   475/1387  4.92 4.78  4.73 4.71  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58   529/1386  4.58 4.35  4.32 4.24  4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75   339/1380  4.75 4.43  4.32 4.30  4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2  1  0  3  5  1  3.50   960/1193  3.50 4.02  4.02 4.04  3.50


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   163/1172  4.83 4.26  4.15 4.12  4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00     1/1182  5.00 4.56  4.35 4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67   480/1170  4.67 4.41  4.38 4.32  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   7   2  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   423/ 800  4.00 4.17  4.06 4.01  4.00

                Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11   0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  38  **** 5.00  4.49 2.25  ****

                Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  ****/  31  **** 5.00  4.72 **** ****

                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0       A    5       Required for Majors   0     Graduate      0       Major        1
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0       B    2
  56-83      1        2.00-2.99   2       C    1       General               3     Under-grad   12       Non-major   11
  84-150     3        3.00-3.49   0       D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   2       F    0       Electives             5     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 1
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  220  01                    University of Maryland                          Page  971
Title         Film & Society In Chin             Baltimore County                          JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Brown,William I                    Spring 2010                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   38
Questionnaires: 31                       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 11  18  4.52  573/1447  4.52 4.31  4.31 4.31  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3 11  17  4.45  604/1447  4.45 4.34  4.27 4.23  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  8  21  4.58  469/1241  4.58 4.48  4.33 4.35  4.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  8  22  4.68  303/1402  4.68 4.36  4.24 4.24  4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  3  8  20  4.55  319/1358  4.55 4.26  4.11 4.12  4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0  1 10  18  4.59  312/1316  4.59 4.27  4.14 4.08  4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  4  6  19  4.32  692/1427  4.32 4.21  4.19 4.14  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  2  29  4.94  339/1447  4.94 4.66  4.69 4.70  4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 0 0  1 14   9  4.33  540/1434  4.33 4.12  4.10 3.97  4.33


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  0  0  0 10  19  4.66  581/1387  4.66 4.45  4.46 4.42  4.66
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  0  0  0  29  5.00    1/1387  5.00 4.78  4.73 4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  1  6  22  4.72  353/1386  4.72 4.35  4.32 4.24  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  0  0  7  22  4.76  339/1380  4.76 4.43  4.32 4.30  4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 0 0 0  0  2  26  4.93   52/1193  4.93 4.02  4.02 4.04  4.93


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 0 1  1  5  12  4.47  402/1172  4.47 4.26  4.15 4.12  4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 1  0  5  13  4.58  508/1182  4.58 4.56  4.35 4.30  4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 1 0  4  14  4.63  501/1170  4.63 4.41  4.38 4.32  4.63
4. Were special techniques successful                  12 13  0  1  0  2   3  4.17 ****/ 800  **** 4.17  4.06 4.01  ****


               Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 30 0 0 0 0  0   1  5.00 ****/ 192  **** 4.00  4.34 4.38  ****


               Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 30 0 0 0 0  0   1  5.00 ****/  62  **** 4.90  4.56 4.28  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    30   0  0  0  0  0   1  5.00 ****/  65  **** 4.55  4.42 4.36  ****


               Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 30   0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  38  **** 5.00  4.49 2.25  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 30   0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  36  **** 4.70  4.25 3.25  ****


               Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 30  0  1  0  0  0   0  1.00 ****/  31  **** 5.00  4.72 ****  ****


                                        Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99   0     A   22      Required for Majors  0      Graduate    0       Major         0
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0     B    2
  56-83      1        2.00-2.99   1     C    0      General             16      Under-grad  31      Non-major    31
  84-150     7        3.00-3.49   3     D    0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   7     F    0      Electives            8      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other                2
                                        ?    1
```

Questionnaires: 24   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	1	7	16	4.63	452/1447	4.63	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	3	3	14	4.38	635/1402	4.38	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	1	5	5	9	3.95	861/1316	3.95	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	673/1447	4.83	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	12	8	4.27	611/1434	4.27	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	322/1387	4.83	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	264/1387	4.95	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	136/1386	4.91	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	379/1380	4.73	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	96/1193	4.82	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	559/1172	4.29	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	553/1182	4.50	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	440/1170	4.71	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	239/ 800	4.43	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.43
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	2.25	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	13
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

```
Course-Section: MLL  280  01                    University of Maryland                        Page  973
Title         Intro Span Spkng World              Baltimore County                          JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Poggio,Sara Z                         Spring 2010                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
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  0  0  3  2  5  3  4  3.18 1392/1447  3.18  4.31  4.31  4.31  3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  4  2  6  3  2  2.82 1416/1447  2.82  4.34  4.27  4.23  2.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  1  2  0  5  4  4  3.53 1134/1241  3.53  4.48  4.33  4.35  3.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  2  3  1  3  4  4  3.33 1307/1402  3.33  4.36  4.24  4.24  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 0 8 2 5  3.47 1182/1358  3.47  4.26  4.11  4.12  3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 6 0 4 3 3  2.81 1278/1316  2.81  4.27  4.14  4.08  2.81
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0  0  6  2  5  3  1  2.47 1399/1427  2.47  4.21  4.19  4.14  2.47
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0  0  0  0  2 14  1  3.94 1387/1447  3.94  4.66  4.69  4.70  3.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 2 5 2 3 4 1 2.60 1399/1434  2.60  4.12  4.10  3.97  2.60

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       0  0  5  2  5  4  1  2.65 1370/1387  2.65  4.45  4.46  4.42  2.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  0  0  1  1  2  5  8  4.06 1311/1387  4.06  4.78  4.73  4.71  4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 6 3 3 3 2  2.53 1366/1386  2.53  4.35  4.32  4.24  2.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    0  0  7  0  4  1  5  2.82 1335/1380  2.82  4.43  4.32  4.30  2.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 6 1 3 3 2 2 3.09 1076/1193  3.09  4.02  4.02  4.04  3.09

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5 0 3 1 4 2 2  2.92 1116/1172  2.92  4.26  4.15  4.12  2.92
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5 0 4 1 3 2 2  2.75 1158/1182  2.75  4.56  4.35  4.30  2.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 4 4 3 0 1 2.17 1166/1170  2.17  4.41  4.38  4.32  2.17
4. Were special techniques successful                 5  2  3  3  2  0  2  2.50  782/ 800  2.50  4.17  4.06  4.01  2.50

              Laboratory
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 192 ****  4.00  4.34  4.38  ****

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  66 ****  3.99  4.58  4.43  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/  62 ****  4.90  4.56  4.28  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  58 ****  4.80  4.41  3.79  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    16 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  65 ****  4.55  4.42  4.36  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                16 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/  64 ****  4.45  4.09  3.70  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0          0.00-0.99   1      A   11        Required for Majors  2      Graduate     0        Major      1
28-55      3          1.00-1.99   0      B    3
56-83      3          2.00-2.99   0      C    1        General              5      Under-grad  17        Non-major 16
84-150     3          3.00-3.49   3      D    0
Grad.      0          3.50-4.00   2      F    0        Electives            5      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                2
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  301  01              University of Maryland                              Page  974
Title        Textual Analysis               Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Fatih,Zakaria                    Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     25
Questionnaires:  20                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   3   1   3   5   7  3.63 1300/1447  3.63  4.31  4.31  4.32  3.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0   0   1   4   9   5  3.95 1105/1447  3.95  4.34  4.27  4.23  3.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   1   1   1   3   6   7  3.94  962/1241  3.94  4.48  4.33  4.33  3.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   2   3   5   9  4.11  910/1402  4.11  4.36  4.24  4.24  4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   2   4   8   5  3.70 1057/1358  3.70  4.26  4.11  4.10  3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0   0   1   0   3   6  10  4.20  671/1316  4.20  4.27  4.14  4.13  4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0   0   1   4   5   9  4.16  874/1427  4.16  4.21  4.19  4.15  4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1  17   2  4.05 1346/1447  4.05  4.66  4.69  4.65  4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0   0   0   8   8   1  3.59 1198/1434  3.59  4.12  4.10  4.09  3.59


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0   0   0   3   4  10  4.41  891/1387  4.41  4.45  4.46  4.44  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   3   0   0   0   1   5  11  4.59 1072/1387  4.59  4.78  4.73  4.71  4.59
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0   0   3   5   4   5  3.65 1225/1386  3.65  4.35  4.32  4.30  3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0   1   2   2   4   8  3.94 1074/1380  3.94  4.43  4.32  4.32  3.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  1   0   1   2   5   7  4.20  526/1193  4.20  4.02  4.02  4.05  4.20


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   0   0   3   5   3  4.00  710/1172  4.00  4.26  4.15  4.24  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   1   0   3   1   6  4.00  856/1182  4.00  4.56  4.35  4.42  4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0   0   0   4   1   6  4.18  804/1170  4.18  4.41  4.38  4.49  4.18
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   1   2   0   3   4   1  3.20  730/ 800  3.20  4.17  4.06  4.12  3.20

                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA       Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0     A   7        Required for Majors  18    Graduate     0     Major        13
  28-55      3      1.00-1.99    1     B   6                                                      Non-major     7
  56-83      3      2.00-2.99    1     C   3        General               1    Under-grad  20     Non-major     7
  84-150     4      3.00-3.49    5     D   1
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    4     F   0        Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                       I   0        Other                 0
                                       ?   1
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  305  01              University of Maryland                            Page  975
Title         Intro Intercultural Co          Baltimore County                          JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Medina,Adriana                    Spring 2010                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     31
Questionnaires: 24                    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  0  1  9 13  4.52   562/1447   4.52 4.31  4.31 4.32  4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  2  8 13  4.48   575/1447   4.48 4.34  4.27 4.23  4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  14  0  0  1  5  4  4.30   743/1241   4.30 4.48  4.33 4.33  4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  1  1  8 13  4.43   579/1402   4.43 4.36  4.24 4.24  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  8 14  4.57   306/1358   4.57 4.26  4.11 4.10  4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  0  8 15  4.65   248/1316   4.65 4.27  4.14 4.13  4.65
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  7  9  7  3.88  1097/1427   3.88 4.21  4.19 4.15  3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  1 23  4.96   243/1447   4.96 4.66  4.69 4.65  4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0  3  7 11  4.38   478/1434   4.38 4.12  4.10 4.09  4.38


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        3   0  1  0  2  4 14  4.43   881/1387   4.43 4.45  4.46 4.44  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  0  1  0 19  4.90   528/1387   4.90 4.78  4.73 4.71  4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  6 14  4.62   496/1386   4.62 4.35  4.32 4.30  4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3   0  0  0  2  4 15  4.62   534/1380   4.62 4.43  4.32 4.32  4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 4 0  3  3  4  7  3.88   769/1193   3.88 4.02  4.02 4.05  3.88


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  0  0  2  3  8  4.46   411/1172   4.46 4.26  4.15 4.24  4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0  0  0  0  5  9  4.64   450/1182   4.64 4.56  4.35 4.42  4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0  0  0  3 11  4.79   352/1170   4.79 4.41  4.38 4.49  4.79
4. Were special techniques successful                  10   1  0  0  1  3  9  4.62   154/ 800   4.62 4.17  4.06 4.12  4.62


               Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  66   **** 3.99  4.58 4.17  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 23 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  62   **** 4.90  4.56 4.21  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 23 0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  58   **** 4.80  4.41 2.87  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    23   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00  ****/  65   **** 4.55  4.42 4.01  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                23   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00  ****/  64   **** 4.45  4.09 3.38  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     1      0.00-0.99   0      A   17       Required for Majors  8     Graduate    0       Major       3
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99   0      B    3
  56-83     1      2.00-2.99   4      C    0       General              5     Under-grad  24      Non-major  21
  84-150    5      3.00-3.49   2      D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   5      F    0       Electives            3     #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                      I    0       Other                0
                                      ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  306  01                University of Maryland                        Page  976
Title          Incc: Community Issues              Baltimore County                       JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:    Poggio,Sara Z                       Spring 2010                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires:  3                        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  1  1  1  4.00 1058/1447  4.00  4.31  4.31  4.32  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  0  1  3.67 1262/1447  3.67  4.34  4.27  4.23  3.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   1  0  1  0  0  1  3.50 1143/1241  3.50  4.48  4.33  4.33  3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33 1307/1402  3.33  4.36  4.24  4.24  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  2  0  1  3.67 1084/1358  3.67  4.26  4.11  4.10  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 0 1 1 3.67 1050/1316  3.67  4.27  4.14  4.13  3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  2  0  0  0  1  2.33 1408/1427  2.33  4.21  4.19  4.15  2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  2  1  4.33 1202/1447  4.33  4.66  4.69  4.65  4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 1349/1434  3.00  4.12  4.10  4.09  3.00


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.45  4.46  4.44  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.78  4.73  4.71  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1386  5.00  4.35  4.32  4.30  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    2   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1380  5.00  4.43  4.32  4.32  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00    1/1193  5.00  4.02  4.02  4.05  5.00


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1172  5.00  4.26  4.15  4.24  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0  0  0  0  1  5.00    1/1182  5.00  4.56  4.35  4.42  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00    1/1170  5.00  4.41  4.38  4.49  5.00


                                            Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                 Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0      0.00-0.99    0        A    1        Required for Majors   2     Graduate     0       Major        1
  28-55     0      1.00-1.99    0        B    1
  56-83     0      2.00-2.99    0        C    0        General               0     Under-grad   3       Non-major    2
  84-150    0      3.00-3.49    0        D    0
  Grad.     0      3.50-4.00    0        F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                    responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 0
                                         ?    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  0  0  2  0  4.00  1058/1447   4.00  4.31  4.31  4.46  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  2  0  4.00  1053/1447   4.00  4.34  4.27  4.30  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1241   5.00  4.48  4.33  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1402   5.00  4.36  4.24  4.29  5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1358   5.00  4.26  4.11  4.26  5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1316   5.00  4.27  4.14  4.34  5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   459/1427   4.50  4.21  4.19  4.25  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1447   5.00  4.66  4.69  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  849/1434   4.00  4.12  4.10  4.21  4.00


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1387   5.00  4.45  4.46  4.51  5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1387   5.00  4.78  4.73  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1386   5.00  4.35  4.32  4.43  5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00     1/1380   5.00  4.43  4.32  4.38  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00  1188/1193   1.00  4.02  4.02  4.02  1.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   377/1172   4.50  4.26  4.15  4.32  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50   553/1182   4.50  4.56  4.35  4.46  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00   1/1170   5.00  4.41  4.38  4.52  5.00
```

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MLL  602  01                  University of Maryland                               Page  978
Title      Ethnography Of Communc                 Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Stolle-McAllist                       Spring 2010                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   12
Questionnaires:   8                     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   1   2   5  4.50  585/1447  4.50 4.31  4.31 4.46  4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   3   4  4.38  715/1447  4.38 4.34  4.27 4.30  4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   1   0   0   2   2   3  4.14  855/1241  4.14 4.48  4.33 4.38  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  591/1402  4.43 4.36  4.24 4.29  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  345/1358  4.50 4.26  4.11 4.26  4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   1   6  4.63  274/1316  4.63 4.27  4.14 4.34  4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   1   0   3   4  4.25  775/1427  4.25 4.21  4.19 4.25  4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   8  5.00    1/1447  5.00 4.66  4.69 4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1  1  0   0   1   3   2  4.17  733/1434  4.17 4.12  4.10 4.21  4.17

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   2   1   5  4.38  931/1387  4.38 4.45  4.46 4.51  4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  604/1387  4.88 4.78  4.73 4.81  4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   4   4  4.50  607/1386  4.50 4.35  4.32 4.43  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   1   0   0   2   5  4.25  887/1380  4.25 4.43  4.32 4.38  4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0   0   1   0   5   2  4.00  652/1193  4.00 4.02  4.02 4.02  4.00

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   1   0   0   7  4.63  309/1172  4.63 4.26  4.15 4.32  4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  229/1182  4.88 4.56  4.35 4.46  4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0   0   0   0   1   7  4.88  254/1170  4.88 4.41  4.38 4.52  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   0   0   1   0   2   5  4.38  267/ 800  4.38 4.17  4.06 4.10  4.38

                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 6  0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   47/  66  4.50 3.99  4.58 4.71  4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 6 0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/  62  5.00 4.90  4.56 4.69  5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 6  0   0   0   0   0   2  5.00    1/  58  5.00 4.80  4.41 4.75  5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    6   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   37/  65  4.50 4.55  4.42 4.64  4.50
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                6   0   0   0   0   1   1  4.50   23/  64  4.50 4.45  4.09 4.18  4.50
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MLL  625  01                    University of Maryland                         Page  979
Title        Inter/Cross-Cult Commu             Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:  Medina,Adriana                     Spring 2010                                   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     24
Questionnaires: 23                    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  0  1  3 18  4.77  287/1447  4.77  4.31  4.31  4.46  4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  2  8 12  4.45  604/1447  4.45  4.34  4.27  4.30  4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  8  0  1  1  5  7  4.29  758/1241  4.29  4.48  4.33  4.38  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  2  3 17  4.68  292/1402  4.68  4.36  4.24  4.29  4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0  4  2 16  4.55  319/1358  4.55  4.26  4.11  4.26  4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 1 8 13 4.55 352/1316 4.55 4.27 4.14 4.34 4.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  1  0  4  0  7 10  4.10  919/1427  4.10  4.21  4.19  4.25  4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  2 20  4.91  485/1447  4.91  4.66  4.69  4.74  4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 8 1 0 0 1 5 8 4.50 341/1434 4.50 4.12 4.10 4.21 4.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3  0  0  1  4  5 10  4.20 1085/1387  4.20  4.45  4.46  4.51  4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3  0  0  0  0  0 20  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.78  4.73  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 1  3  8  9  4.19  927/1386  4.19  4.35  4.32  4.43  4.19
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3  0  0  1  0  6 13  4.55  604/1380  4.55  4.43  4.32  4.38  4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 1 3 3  6  5  3.61  921/1193  3.61  4.02  4.02  4.02  3.61


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 4 17  4.81  181/1172  4.81  4.26  4.15  4.32  4.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 2 0 19  4.81  303/1182  4.81  4.56  4.35  4.46  4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0 0 0 0 1 21 4.95 112/1170 4.95 4.41 4.38 4.52 4.95
4. Were special techniques successful                 2  0  0  0  0  3 18  4.86   84/ 800  4.86  4.17  4.06  4.10  4.86


                 Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 21 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/  66  ****  3.99  4.58  4.71  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 21 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 62  ****  4.90  4.56  4.69  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 21 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/  58  ****  4.80  4.41  4.75  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   21  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  65  ****  4.55  4.42  4.64  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               21  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  64  ****  4.45  4.09  4.18  ****


                 Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 38  ****  5.00  4.49  4.77  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 36  ****  4.70  4.25  4.39  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.52  4.83  ****


                 Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 22 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 5.00 4.72 4.85 ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  21  ****  5.00  4.57  4.65  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     22  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  5.00  4.64  4.59  ****


                              Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                  Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      5       0.00-0.99    0       A   17       Required for Majors  17      Graduate     12      Major        0
28-55      0       1.00-1.99    0       B    2
56-83      0       2.00-2.99    0       C    0       General               1      Under-grad   11      Non-major   23
84-150     0       3.00-3.49    0       D    0
Grad.     12       3.50-4.00   12       F    0       Electives             2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 0
                                        ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: MLL  660  1                   University of Maryland                              Page  980
Title      Intercultural Communic                 Baltimore County                              JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Larkey,Edward                          Spring 2010                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      7
Questionnaires:  7                    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   7  5.00    1/1447  5.00  4.31  4.31  4.46  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  154/1447  4.86  4.34  4.27  4.30  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   3   0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1241  5.00  4.48  4.33  4.38  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  591/1402  4.43  4.36  4.24  4.29  4.43
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  112/1358  4.86  4.26  4.11  4.26  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   0   0   1   6  4.86  102/1316  4.86  4.27  4.14  4.34  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   0   0   1   2   4  4.43  568/1427  4.43  4.21  4.19  4.25  4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1447  5.00  4.66  4.69  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 3 0   0   0   2   2  4.50  341/1434  4.50  4.12  4.10  4.21  4.50

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  276/1387  4.86  4.45  4.46  4.51  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   0   0   0   7  5.00    1/1387  5.00  4.78  4.73  4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  194/1386  4.86  4.35  4.32  4.43  4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   0   0   0   2   5  4.71  392/1380  4.71  4.43  4.32  4.38  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 3  0   0   0   0   4  5.00    1/1193  5.00  4.02  4.02  4.02  5.00

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  152/1172  4.86  4.26  4.15  4.32  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0  0   0   0   0   1   6  4.86  250/1182  4.86  4.56  4.35  4.46  4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0  0   0   0   1   6  4.86  275/1170  4.86  4.41  4.38  4.52  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  0   2   0   1   0   1   3  4.20  366/ 800  4.20  4.17  4.06  4.10  4.20

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2  0   0   0   0   1   4  4.80   30/  66  4.80  3.99  4.58  4.71  4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2 0  0   0   0   1   4  4.80   28/  62  4.80  4.90  4.56  4.69  4.80
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2  0   0   0   1   0   4  4.60   30/  58  4.60  4.80  4.41  4.75  4.60
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    2   0   0   0   0   2   3  4.60   34/  65  4.60  4.55  4.42  4.64  4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                2   0   0   0   1   1   3  4.40   28/  64  4.40  4.45  4.09  4.18  4.40

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: MLL  670  01                     University of Maryland                              Page  981
Title         L2 Acq Learn: Thry-Pra              Baltimore County                                  JUN 28, 2010
Instructor:   Oscoz,Ana R                         Spring 2010                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:       8
Questionnaires:   8                    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   2  0  0  0  1  3  2  4.17   954/1447  4.17  4.31  4.31  4.46  4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  0  2  2  2  4.00  1053/1447  4.00  4.34  4.27  4.30  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  3  0  0  1  1  1  4.00   923/1241  4.00  4.48  4.33  4.38  4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50   494/1402  4.50  4.36  4.24  4.29  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  2  1  2  4.00   799/1358  4.00  4.26  4.11  4.26  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  1  1  0  2  3.20  1235/1316  3.20  4.27  4.14  4.34  3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3  0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60   337/1427  4.60  4.21  4.19  4.25  4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3  0  0  0  0  0  5  5.00     1/1447  5.00  4.66  4.69  4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  1  0  1  2  2  0  3.20  1325/1434  3.20  4.12  4.10  4.21  3.20


         Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33   970/1387  4.33  4.45  4.46  4.51  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   707/1387  4.83  4.78  4.73  4.81  4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  1  1  2  2  3.83  1160/1386  3.83  4.35  4.32  4.43  3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  1  0  2  3  4.17   959/1380  4.17  4.43  4.32  4.38  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  3  2  1  3.67   895/1193  3.67  4.02  4.02  4.02  3.67


         Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33   521/1172  4.33  4.26  4.15  4.32  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83   271/1182  4.83  4.56  4.35  4.46  4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33   710/1170  4.33  4.41  4.38  4.52  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  2  1  0  0  0  3  2  4.40   250/ 800  4.40  4.17  4.06  4.10  4.40

                                        Frequency Distribution

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