

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 190 01
Title:	The World Of Language I
Instructor:	Westphal,German

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	3	5	10	4.15	997/1449	4.15	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.15
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	3	1	3	5	7	3.63	1285/1446	3.63	4.47	4.29	4.20	3.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	0	3	5	8	3.65	1127/1256	3.65	4.56	4.34	4.21	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	12	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	810/1402	4.25	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	801/1358	4.05	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	14	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	253/1327	4.67	4.35	4.16	3.92	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	4	3	13	4.45	545/1435	4.45	4.33	4.20	4.11	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	1019/1446	4.50	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	5	5	5	2	3.11	1357/1437	3.11	4.26	4.12	4.04	3.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	4	5	8	3.75	1272/1386	3.75	4.58	4.48	4.40	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	0	6	12	4.40	1223/1390	4.40	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	2	3	4	7	3.40	1295/1379	3.40	4.47	4.34	4.28	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	2	3	3	8	3.45	1273/1379	3.45	4.58	4.36	4.26	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	3	7	5	3.72	926/1236	3.72	4.17	4.08	3.93	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	931/1121	3.50	4.38	4.18	3.89	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	857/1122	4.00	4.64	4.36	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	2	0	0	0	6	4.00	855/1121	4.00	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/790	****	4.26	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 190 01
Title:	The World Of Language I
Instructor:	Westphal,German

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	41
Questionnaires:	21

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	21	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 191 01
Title:	The World Of Language II
Instructor:	McCray,Stanley

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	86
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	13	29	4.48	635/1449	4.48	4.45	4.33	4.14	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	9	35	4.66	368/1446	4.66	4.47	4.29	4.20	4.66
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	8	39	4.79	225/1256	4.79	4.56	4.34	4.21	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	20	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	408/1402	4.61	4.50	4.27	4.10	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	2	5	10	30	4.45	438/1358	4.45	4.40	4.13	4.04	4.45
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	24	0	0	3	5	16	4.54	366/1327	4.54	4.35	4.16	3.92	4.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	9	36	4.67	313/1435	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.11	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	29	17	4.34	1143/1446	4.34	4.68	4.67	4.57	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	15	1	0	2	6	9	17	4.21	691/1437	4.21	4.26	4.12	4.04	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	5	11	29	4.53	774/1386	4.53	4.58	4.48	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	3	4	38	4.78	838/1390	4.78	4.83	4.74	4.67	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	4	10	31	4.60	518/1379	4.60	4.47	4.34	4.28	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	5	8	30	4.52	666/1379	4.52	4.58	4.36	4.26	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	8	2	0	4	5	24	4.40	436/1236	4.40	4.17	4.08	3.93	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	29	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	547/1121	4.33	4.38	4.18	3.89	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	28	0	1	2	2	3	14	4.23	764/1122	4.23	4.64	4.36	4.09	4.23
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	28	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	416/1121	4.73	4.58	4.40	4.08	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	29	10	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	****/790	****	4.26	4.06	3.89	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 191 01
Title:	The World Of Language II
Instructor:	McCray,Stanley

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	86
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	45	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.19	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	46	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	46	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	46	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.55	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	46	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.42	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	45	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	46	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	46	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	4.01	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	3.95	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	46	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	3.44	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	47	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	2.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	47	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/35	****	****	4.15	5.00	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	47	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.09	5.00	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	47	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.75	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	47	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	****	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	46	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	46	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.88	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	46	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.64	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 191 01
Title:	The World Of Language II
Instructor:	McCray,Stanley

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	86
Questionnaires:	50

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	46	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.50	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	46	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	4.63	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	37	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	17	Under-grad	50	Non-major	48
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	11						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 215 01
Title:	French Film Classics
Instructor:	Bazgan,Nicoleta

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	3	1	7	4.08	1059/1449	4.08	4.45	4.33	4.32	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	571/1446	4.50	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	400/1256	4.64	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	706/1402	4.36	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	1154/1358	3.55	4.40	4.13	4.13	3.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1032/1327	3.73	4.35	4.16	4.12	3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	598/1435	4.42	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	788/1446	4.75	4.68	4.67	4.63	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	638/1437	4.25	4.26	4.12	4.10	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.58	4.48	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	770/1379	4.40	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	943/1379	4.20	4.58	4.36	4.37	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	192/1236	4.70	4.17	4.08	4.16	4.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1121	****	4.38	4.18	4.11	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1122	****	4.64	4.36	4.34	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1121	****	4.58	4.40	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MLL 215 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 29
Title: French Film Classics		Questionnaires: 12
Instructor: Bazgan,Nicoleta		

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

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades		Reasons			Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	12	Non-major	11
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 220 01
Title:	Film & Society In China
Instructor:	Brown,William I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	5	19	4.72	299/1449	4.72	4.45	4.33	4.32	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	149/1446	4.84	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	215/1256	4.80	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	136/1402	4.87	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	198/1358	4.71	4.40	4.13	4.13	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	20	4.76	173/1327	4.76	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	336/1435	4.64	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	740/1446	4.79	4.68	4.67	4.63	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	226/1437	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.10	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	21	4.88	254/1386	4.88	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	266/1390	4.96	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	223/1379	4.83	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	152/1379	4.92	4.58	4.36	4.37	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	77/1236	4.90	4.17	4.08	4.16	4.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	283/1121	4.67	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	1	0	10	4.58	471/1122	4.58	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	292/1121	4.83	4.58	4.40	4.39	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	14	6	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	****/790	****	4.26	4.06	4.01	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 220 01
Title:	Film & Society In China
Instructor:	Brown,William I

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	36
Questionnaires:	26

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	3.19	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A 20	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 2		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	10 Under-grad 26 Non-major 26
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	5 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	6
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 4		

**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 230 01
Title:	World Lang Communities
Instructor:	Stolle-McAllist

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	8	13	4.62	446/1449	4.62	4.45	4.33	4.32	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	16	4.57	479/1446	4.57	4.47	4.29	4.27	4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	422/1256	4.62	4.56	4.34	4.36	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	613/1402	4.44	4.50	4.27	4.28	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	16	4.62	276/1358	4.62	4.40	4.13	4.13	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	440/1327	4.47	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	313/1435	4.67	4.33	4.20	4.17	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	263/1446	4.95	4.68	4.67	4.63	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	11	4.53	347/1437	4.53	4.26	4.12	4.10	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	443/1386	4.76	4.58	4.48	4.46	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	266/1390	4.95	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	15	4.57	553/1379	4.57	4.47	4.34	4.31	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	385/1379	4.75	4.58	4.36	4.37	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	159/1236	4.75	4.17	4.08	4.16	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	7	4	4.36	520/1121	4.36	4.38	4.18	4.11	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	264/1122	4.82	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	211/1121	4.91	4.58	4.40	4.39	4.91
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	259/790	4.40	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.40

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 230 01
Title:	World Lang Communities
Instructor:	Stolle-McAllist

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	32
Questionnaires:	21

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	15	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 280 01
Title:	Intro Span Spkng World
Instructor:	Poggio,Sara Z

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	6	6	7	3	3.13	1411/1449	3.13	4.45	4.33	4.32	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	5	6	6	3	2.96	1417/1446	2.96	4.47	4.29	4.27	2.96
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	10	3	5	3.21	1224/1256	3.21	4.56	4.34	4.36	3.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	11	3	5	3.30	1325/1402	3.30	4.50	4.27	4.28	3.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	5	7	6	3.52	1164/1358	3.52	4.40	4.13	4.13	3.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	6	6	5	3.35	1192/1327	3.35	4.35	4.16	4.12	3.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	6	5	5	7	3.57	1250/1435	3.57	4.33	4.20	4.17	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	20	3	4.08	1324/1446	4.08	4.68	4.67	4.63	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	4	11	3	0	2.84	1394/1437	2.84	4.26	4.12	4.10	2.84
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	4	7	8	1	3.00	1362/1386	3.00	4.58	4.48	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	17	4.65	1014/1390	4.65	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.65
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	5	7	7	3	3.26	1314/1379	3.26	4.47	4.34	4.31	3.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	9	6	2	3.14	1329/1379	3.14	4.58	4.36	4.37	3.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	2	2	6	5	4	3.37	1067/1236	3.37	4.17	4.08	4.16	3.37
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	3	8	5	3.94	772/1121	3.94	4.38	4.18	4.11	3.94
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	722/1122	4.29	4.64	4.36	4.34	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	805/1121	4.18	4.58	4.40	4.39	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	1	2	4	6	4	3.59	614/790	3.59	4.26	4.06	4.01	3.59

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 280 01
Title:	Intro Span Spkng World
Instructor:	Poggio,Sara Z

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.35	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.10	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.32	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.10	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.48	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.17	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	3.96	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.48	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	3.66	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	3.19	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	3.74	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	3.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	3.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	2.63	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	3.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	3.75	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 280 01
Title:	Intro Span Spkng World
Instructor:	Poggio,Sara Z

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	3.75	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	3.25	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	5	General	13	Under-grad	24	Non-major	19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 301 01
Title:	Textual Analysis
Instructor:	Field,Thomas T

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	4	11	4.37	783/1449	4.37	4.45	4.33	4.38	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	12	4.58	479/1446	4.58	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	236/1256	4.79	4.56	4.34	4.39	4.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	14	4.68	316/1402	4.68	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	3	12	4.32	568/1358	4.32	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	281/1327	4.63	4.35	4.16	4.23	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	14	4.58	411/1435	4.58	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.58
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	316/1446	4.95	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	459/1437	4.41	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.41
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	220/1386	4.89	4.58	4.48	4.53	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	319/1390	4.95	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	410/1379	4.68	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	16	4.74	415/1379	4.74	4.58	4.36	4.40	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	82/1236	4.89	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	326/1121	4.62	4.38	4.18	4.31	4.62
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	512/1122	4.54	4.64	4.36	4.46	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	447/1121	4.69	4.58	4.40	4.53	4.69
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	329/790	4.25	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 301 01
Title:	Textual Analysis
Instructor:	Field,Thomas T

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	20

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	13
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 305 01
Title:	Intro Intercultural Comm
Instructor:	Medina,Adriana

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	30
Questionnaires:	24

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	1	4	3	14	4.36	783/1449	4.36	4.45	4.33	4.38	4.36
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	453/1446	4.59	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	14	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.56	4.34	4.39	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	396/1402	4.62	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	353/1358	4.52	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	5	13	4.33	591/1327	4.33	4.35	4.16	4.23	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	4	1	14	4.24	788/1435	4.24	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	938/1446	4.62	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.62
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	417/1437	4.45	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	204/1386	4.90	4.58	4.48	4.53	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	384/1379	4.70	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	239/1379	4.85	4.58	4.36	4.40	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	4	2	12	4.44	394/1236	4.44	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	431/1121	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.31	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	1	11	4.57	479/1122	4.57	4.64	4.36	4.46	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	350/1121	4.79	4.58	4.40	4.53	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	53/790	4.93	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.93

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MLL 305 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 30
Title: Intro Intercultural Comm		Questionnaires: 24
Instructor: Medina,Adriana		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	4	Under-grad	24	Non-major	23
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	5						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 306 01
Title:	Incc: Community Issues
Instructor:	Poggio,Sara Z

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	12

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	3	4	3.91	1187/1449	3.91	4.45	4.33	4.38	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	1	3.73	1247/1446	3.73	4.47	4.29	4.33	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	686/1256	4.36	4.56	4.34	4.39	4.36
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1022/1402	4.00	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	578/1358	4.30	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	704/1327	4.20	4.35	4.16	4.23	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1295/1435	3.40	4.33	4.20	4.25	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	7	3	4.30	1176/1446	4.30	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	6	3	0	3.33	1311/1437	3.33	4.26	4.12	4.14	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	1	6	2	3.73	1282/1386	3.73	4.58	4.48	4.53	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	923/1390	4.73	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	3	2	3.55	1251/1379	3.55	4.47	4.34	4.38	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	5	4.00	1053/1379	4.00	4.58	4.36	4.40	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	383/1236	4.45	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	587/1121	4.29	4.38	4.18	4.31	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	691/1122	4.33	4.64	4.36	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	817/1121	4.14	4.58	4.40	4.53	4.14
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	697/790	3.25	4.26	4.06	4.11	3.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 306 01
Title:	Incc: Community Issues
Instructor:	Poggio,Sara Z

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	18
Questionnaires:	12

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

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 311 01
Title:	Intro to Korean Culture
Instructor:	Yoon,Kyung-Eun

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	22

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	4	17	4.81	218/1449	4.81	4.45	4.33	4.38	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	10	10	4.43	677/1446	4.43	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	717/1256	4.33	4.56	4.34	4.39	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	570/1402	4.48	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	276/1358	4.62	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	10	8	4.24	679/1327	4.24	4.35	4.16	4.23	4.24
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	5	11	4.24	788/1435	4.24	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	526/1446	4.90	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	493/1437	4.39	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	630/1386	4.65	4.58	4.48	4.53	4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	872/1390	4.75	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	576/1379	4.55	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	688/1379	4.50	4.58	4.36	4.40	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	5	4	11	4.30	516/1236	4.30	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	484/1121	4.40	4.38	4.18	4.31	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	574/1122	4.47	4.64	4.36	4.46	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	524/1121	4.60	4.58	4.40	4.53	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	300/790	4.31	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.31

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MLL 311 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 26
Title: Intro to Korean Culture		Questionnaires: 22
Instructor: Yoon, Kyung-Eun		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7 Required for Majors	6 Graduate	0 Major
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 1 General	5	Under-grad 22 Non-major 20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0 Electives	6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0 Other	0	
			? 4		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 315 01
Title:	Contemporary Kor Films
Instructor:	Yoon,Kyung-Eun

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	29
Questionnaires:	19

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	16	4.84	184/1449	4.84	4.45	4.33	4.38	4.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	149/1446	4.84	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.84
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	367/1256	4.67	4.56	4.34	4.39	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	373/1402	4.63	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	258/1358	4.63	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	158/1327	4.79	4.35	4.16	4.23	4.79
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	236/1435	4.74	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	566/1446	4.88	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	448/1437	4.43	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.58	4.48	4.53	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	1	15	4.76	302/1379	4.76	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	461/1379	4.71	4.58	4.36	4.40	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	97/1236	4.87	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.87
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	129/1121	4.88	4.38	4.18	4.31	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	322/1122	4.75	4.64	4.36	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	246/1121	4.88	4.58	4.40	4.53	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	11	5	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/790	****	4.26	4.06	4.11	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section: MLL 315 01	Term - Spring 2011	Enrollment: 29
Title: Contemporary Kor Films		Questionnaires: 19
Instructor: Yoon, Kyung-Eun		

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27 0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55 2	1.00-1.99 0	B 8			
56-83 0	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General 2	Under-grad 19	Non-major 19
84-150 3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0			
Grad. 0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 6	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
		P 0			
		I 0	Other 1		
		? 6			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 371 01
Title:	20Th C Russian Lit & Pol
Instructor:	Rusinko,Elaine

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	13	4.65	404/1449	4.65	4.45	4.33	4.38	4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	544/1446	4.53	4.47	4.29	4.33	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	696/1256	4.35	4.56	4.34	4.39	4.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	492/1402	4.53	4.50	4.27	4.37	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	118/1358	4.82	4.40	4.13	4.14	4.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	765/1327	4.13	4.35	4.16	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	10	4.29	729/1435	4.29	4.33	4.20	4.25	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	776/1446	4.76	4.68	4.67	4.68	4.76
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	6	8	4.25	638/1437	4.25	4.26	4.12	4.14	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	122/1386	4.94	4.58	4.48	4.53	4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	582/1390	4.88	4.83	4.74	4.76	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	223/1379	4.82	4.47	4.34	4.38	4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	370/1379	4.76	4.58	4.36	4.40	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	1	2	12	4.35	476/1236	4.35	4.17	4.08	4.18	4.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	440/1121	4.45	4.38	4.18	4.31	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	351/1122	4.73	4.64	4.36	4.46	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	1	0	9	4.55	564/1121	4.55	4.58	4.40	4.53	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	512/790	3.88	4.26	4.06	4.11	3.88

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 371 01
Title:	20Th C Russian Lit & Pol
Instructor:	Rusinko,Elaine

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/200	****	****	4.28	4.44	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/205	****	****	4.29	4.44	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/201	****	****	4.51	4.59	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/202	****	****	4.42	4.48	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/196	****	****	4.25	4.37	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.70	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.64	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/34	****	****	4.33	4.87	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/35	****	****	4.15	4.66	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.09	4.61	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/30	****	****	4.04	4.49	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.13	4.33	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	5.00	****

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 371 01
Title:	20Th C Russian Lit & Pol
Instructor:	Rusinko,Elaine

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	26
Questionnaires:	17

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Self Paced														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/13	****	****	4.07	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	2						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 601 01
Title:	Intercultural Pragmatics
Instructor:	Provencher,Deni

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	12	4.63	432/1449	4.63	4.45	4.33	4.41	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	121/1446	4.88	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	215/1256	4.80	4.56	4.34	4.30	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	129/1402	4.88	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	163/1358	4.75	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	180/1327	4.75	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	107/1435	4.88	4.33	4.20	4.23	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	368/1446	4.94	4.68	4.67	4.81	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	226/1437	4.67	4.26	4.12	4.17	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	254/1386	4.88	4.58	4.48	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	372/1390	4.94	4.83	4.74	4.77	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	410/1379	4.69	4.47	4.34	4.34	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	118/1379	4.94	4.58	4.36	4.35	4.94
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	249/1236	4.63	4.17	4.08	3.94	4.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	283/1121	4.67	4.38	4.18	4.29	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	537/1122	4.50	4.64	4.36	4.44	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	383/1121	4.75	4.58	4.40	4.52	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	200/790	4.50	4.26	4.06	4.08	4.50

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 601 01
Title:	Intercultural Pragmatics
Instructor:	Provencher,Deni

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	16
Questionnaires:	16

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.02	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.34	4.38	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/18	****	****	4.13	4.22	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/24	****	****	4.34	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/15	****	****	4.18	4.75	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1 A 9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	7	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0 B 4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0 C 0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2 D 0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 602 01
Title:	Ethnography Of Communctn
Instructor:	Ka,Omar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	11

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	2	1	6	3.91	1187/1449	3.91	4.45	4.33	4.41	3.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	2	3.82	1203/1446	3.82	4.47	4.29	4.30	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	749/1256	4.30	4.56	4.34	4.30	4.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	859/1402	4.20	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	521/1358	4.36	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	792/1327	4.10	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	1060/1435	3.91	4.33	4.20	4.23	3.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	728/1446	4.80	4.68	4.67	4.81	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	5	2	2	3.50	1245/1437	3.50	4.26	4.12	4.17	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1325/1386	3.45	4.58	4.48	4.47	3.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	923/1390	4.73	4.83	4.74	4.77	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	1229/1379	3.64	4.47	4.34	4.34	3.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	3	3.55	1244/1379	3.55	4.58	4.36	4.35	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	2	1	0	2	3.00	1144/1236	3.00	4.17	4.08	3.94	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	1	1	6	3.90	803/1121	3.90	4.38	4.18	4.29	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	537/1122	4.50	4.64	4.36	4.44	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	524/1121	4.60	4.58	4.40	4.52	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	697/790	3.25	4.26	4.06	4.08	3.25

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 602 01
Title:	Ethnography Of Communctn
Instructor:	Ka,Omar

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	13
Questionnaires:	11

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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors 9	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 7 Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 1		

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 625 01
Title:	Inter/Cross-Cult Commun
Instructor:	Medina,Adriana

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	0	1	4	14	4.50	594/1449	4.50	4.45	4.33	4.41	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	11	4.40	704/1446	4.40	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	619/1256	4.43	4.56	4.34	4.30	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	7	11	4.30	762/1402	4.30	4.50	4.27	4.26	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	13	4.40	483/1358	4.40	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	464/1327	4.45	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	1	1	14	4.10	918/1435	4.10	4.33	4.20	4.23	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	244/1437	4.64	4.26	4.12	4.17	4.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	903/1386	4.42	4.58	4.48	4.47	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	266/1390	4.95	4.83	4.74	4.77	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	635/1379	4.50	4.47	4.34	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	14	4.55	633/1379	4.55	4.58	4.36	4.35	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	4	4	10	4.05	692/1236	4.05	4.17	4.08	3.94	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	292/1121	4.65	4.38	4.18	4.29	4.65
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	170/1122	4.90	4.64	4.36	4.44	4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	106/1121	4.95	4.58	4.40	4.52	4.95
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	158/790	4.60	4.26	4.06	4.08	4.60

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 625 01
Title:	Inter/Cross-Cult Commun
Instructor:	Medina,Adriana

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	20
Questionnaires:	20

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	9	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 660 01
Title:	Intercultural Communicat
Instructor:	Larkey,Edward

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	5.00	1/1449	5.00	4.45	4.33	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	571/1446	4.50	4.47	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.56	4.34	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.50	4.27	4.26	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.40	4.13	4.18	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1327	4.75	4.35	4.16	4.29	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	769/1435	4.25	4.33	4.20	4.23	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1019/1446	4.50	4.68	4.67	4.81	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	364/1437	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.17	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.58	4.48	4.47	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1390	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.47	4.34	4.34	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1379	5.00	4.58	4.36	4.35	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1227/1236	2.00	4.17	4.08	3.94	2.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.38	4.18	4.29	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1122	5.00	4.64	4.36	4.44	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1121	5.00	4.58	4.40	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/790	5.00	4.26	4.06	4.08	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 660 01
Title:	Intercultural Communicat
Instructor:	Larkey,Edward

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	4
Questionnaires:	4

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/67	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.67	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/66	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.36	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/64	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.32	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/75	5.00	5.00	4.32	4.37	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	50/73	3.75	3.75	4.00	4.02	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 670 01
Title:	L2 Acq Learn: Thry-Prac
Instructor:	Oscoz,Ana R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	4	5	4	3.86	1212/1449	3.86	4.45	4.33	4.41	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1218/1446	3.79	4.47	4.29	4.30	3.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1256	4.50	4.56	4.34	4.30	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1286/1402	3.46	4.50	4.27	4.26	3.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	737/1358	4.14	4.40	4.13	4.18	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	1127/1327	3.50	4.35	4.16	4.29	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	2	5	3.57	1248/1435	3.57	4.33	4.20	4.23	3.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1446	5.00	4.68	4.67	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	3	3	3.67	1172/1437	3.67	4.26	4.12	4.17	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	972/1386	4.36	4.58	4.48	4.47	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	821/1390	4.79	4.83	4.74	4.77	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	1030/1379	4.07	4.47	4.34	4.34	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	3	6	4.00	1053/1379	4.00	4.58	4.36	4.35	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	2	4	6	4.00	709/1236	4.00	4.17	4.08	3.94	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	431/1121	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.29	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	512/1122	4.54	4.64	4.36	4.44	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	570/1121	4.54	4.58	4.40	4.52	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	413/790	4.08	4.26	4.06	4.08	4.08

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

Course-Section:	MLL 670 01
Title:	L2 Acq Learn: Thry-Prac
Instructor:	Oscoz,Ana R

Term - Spring 2011

Enrollment:	14
Questionnaires:	14

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/67	****	5.00	4.58	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/66	****	5.00	4.36	4.36	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/64	****	5.00	4.25	4.32	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/75	****	5.00	4.32	4.37	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/73	****	3.75	4.00	4.02	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	12	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	2	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	2						