

Course-Section: GWST 100 0101  
 Title INTRO GENDER & WOMEN  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 906  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	643/1670	4.53	4.45	4.31	4.23	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	7	4.12	1125/1666	4.12	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	1018/1615	4.12	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	419/1566	4.47	4.41	4.07	4.03	4.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	5	7	3.94	983/1528	3.94	4.40	4.12	4.00	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	8	4.00	1135/1650	4.00	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	9	6	0	3.24	1659/1667	3.24	4.39	4.67	4.61	3.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	808/1626	4.19	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1211/1559	4.18	4.31	4.46	4.47	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	803/1560	4.82	4.91	4.72	4.68	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	0	13	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.59	4.31	4.32	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	755/1546	4.47	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	3	8	3	3.87	849/1323	3.87	4.19	4.00	3.91	3.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	340/1384	4.64	4.64	4.10	3.92	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.61	4.29	4.09	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	550/1378	4.64	4.72	4.31	4.08	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	328/ 904	4.33	4.17	4.03	3.94	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.25	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	4.35	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 230	****	****	4.44	4.58	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 231	****	****	4.31	4.45	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 218	****	****	4.18	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GWST 100H 0101  
 Title INTRO GENDER & WOMEN  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 907  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5						Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	809/1670	4.40	4.45	4.31	4.23	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1199/1666	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.31	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	944/1615	4.20	4.46	4.24	4.17	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.41	4.07	4.03	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	760/1528	4.20	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	720/1650	4.40	4.37	4.22	4.28	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1648/1667	3.50	4.39	4.67	4.61	3.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	728/1626	4.25	4.29	4.11	4.07	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	2.75	1532/1559	2.75	4.31	4.46	4.47	2.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.32	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	407/1546	4.75	4.58	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3.25	1125/1323	3.25	4.19	4.00	3.91	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	372/1384	4.60	4.64	4.10	3.92	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1378	4.80	4.72	4.31	4.08	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	243/ 904	4.50	4.17	4.03	3.94	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GWST 200 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN FEM ACTIVIS  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 908  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	5	8	16	4.19	1060/1670	4.19	4.45	4.31	4.32	4.19
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	10	14	4.13	1114/1666	4.13	4.37	4.27	4.27	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	23	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	****/1406	****	4.54	4.32	4.39	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	8	16	4.31	800/1615	4.31	4.46	4.24	4.29	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	3	6	19	4.29	599/1566	4.29	4.41	4.07	4.00	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	11	16	4.32	641/1528	4.32	4.40	4.12	4.11	4.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	5	21	4.45	645/1650	4.45	4.37	4.22	4.20	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	10	21	4.68	1012/1667	4.68	4.39	4.67	4.64	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	3	7	12	4.08	910/1626	4.08	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	2	4	10	10	4.08	1263/1559	4.08	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	2	2	22	4.77	929/1560	4.77	4.91	4.72	4.73	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	994/1549	4.23	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	3	8	14	4.31	949/1546	4.31	4.58	4.32	4.30	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	1	1	6	16	4.54	304/1323	4.54	4.19	4.00	4.08	4.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	4	3	16	4.38	570/1384	4.38	4.64	4.10	4.07	4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	540/1378	4.58	4.61	4.29	4.25	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	627/1378	4.54	4.72	4.31	4.26	4.54
4. Were special techniques successful	7	7	1	0	5	4	7	3.94	526/ 904	3.94	4.17	4.03	4.01	3.94

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 17	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 9			
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	5	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 31	Non-major 22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 17		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	1	4	4	12	4.00	1216/1670	4.14	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	9	4	7	3.65	1457/1666	3.85	4.37	4.27	4.18	3.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1406	4.29	4.54	4.32	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	2	9	8	3.95	1158/1615	4.13	4.46	4.24	4.18	3.95
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	3	12	3.96	930/1566	4.20	4.41	4.07	4.04	3.96
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	8	7	3.83	1105/1528	4.14	4.40	4.12	4.07	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	3	2	10	5	3.71	1382/1650	3.83	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	7	15	4.68	1002/1667	4.52	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.68
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	0	4	7	5	3.88	1143/1626	4.08	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	5	6	7	3.90	1352/1559	4.01	4.31	4.46	4.40	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	298/1560	4.84	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	1146/1549	4.08	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	2	2	1	3	5	8	3.84	1256/1546	3.95	4.58	4.32	4.24	3.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.19	4.00	3.99	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	5	3	9	4.24	683/1384	4.31	4.64	4.10	4.12	4.24
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	540/1378	4.49	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	492/1378	4.55	4.72	4.31	4.33	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	373/ 904	4.27	4.17	4.03	4.03	4.25
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.54	2.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 10	****	****	4.84	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 6	****	****	4.92	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 14			
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 23	Non-major 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GWST 322 0201  
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA  
 Instructor: TAYLOR, DABRINA  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 910  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	974/1670	4.14	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	4	9	4.06	1167/1666	3.85	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	852/1406	4.29	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	2	1	3	10	4.31	800/1615	4.13	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	450/1566	4.20	4.41	4.07	4.04	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	504/1528	4.14	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	5	3	8	3.94	1220/1650	3.83	4.37	4.22	4.12	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	8	8	4.35	1295/1667	4.52	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.35	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	2	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	693/1626	4.08	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	4	2	10	4.11	1249/1559	4.01	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	1004/1560	4.84	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.72	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	5	9	4.17	1053/1549	4.08	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	3	2	10	4.06	1121/1546	3.95	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	3	0	14	4.50	326/1323	4.50	4.19	4.00	3.99	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	560/1384	4.31	4.64	4.10	4.12	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	740/1378	4.49	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.38	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	768/1378	4.55	4.72	4.31	4.33	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	6	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	356/ 904	4.27	4.17	4.03	4.03	4.29	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GWST 338 0101  
 Title WOMEN AND LAW  
 Instructor: BEARSCH, LAURA (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 911  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	719/1666	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	737/1615	4.37	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	5	3	8	3.74	1159/1566	3.74	4.41	4.07	4.04	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	10	4.10	842/1528	4.10	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	1079/1650	4.11	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	2	3	6	0	3.36	1452/1626	3.36	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	689/1559	4.63	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	725/1560	4.93	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	14	4.55	622/1549	4.68	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.68
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	715/1546	4.65	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	879/1323	3.82	4.19	4.00	3.99	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	580/1378	4.61	4.72	4.31	4.33	4.61
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	3	3	2	6	3.44	748/ 904	3.44	4.17	4.03	4.03	3.44

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: GWST 338 0101  
 Title WOMEN AND LAW  
 Instructor: (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 912  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	4	6	8	4.00	1216/1670	4.00	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	719/1666	4.45	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	715/1406	4.40	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	2	13	4.37	737/1615	4.37	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.37	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	5	3	8	3.74	1159/1566	3.74	4.41	4.07	4.04	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	6	10	4.10	842/1528	4.10	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	1079/1650	4.11	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.11	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	16	4	4.20	1409/1667	4.20	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	17	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1626	3.36	4.29	4.11	4.06	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	15	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	772/1559	4.63	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	15	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	4.93	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	294/1549	4.68	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.68	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	345/1546	4.65	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	15	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1323	3.82	4.19	4.00	3.99	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	434/1384	4.50	4.64	4.10	4.12	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	2	14	4.61	580/1378	4.61	4.72	4.31	4.33	4.61	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	2	3	3	2	6	3.44	748/ 904	3.44	4.17	4.03	4.03	3.44	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 20	Non-major 20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 0			

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	7	13	4.50	665/1670	4.50	4.45	4.31	4.24	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	14	4.50	622/1666	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	964/1406	4.14	4.54	4.32	4.22	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	592/1615	4.48	4.46	4.24	4.18	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	15	4.50	389/1566	4.50	4.41	4.07	4.04	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	300/1528	4.67	4.40	4.12	4.07	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	338/1650	4.68	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	338/1667	4.95	4.39	4.67	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	223/1626	4.73	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	18	4.68	640/1559	4.68	4.31	4.46	4.40	4.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	596/1560	4.91	4.91	4.72	4.67	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	410/1549	4.73	4.59	4.31	4.25	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	557/1546	4.64	4.58	4.32	4.24	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	3	7	8	4.05	674/1323	4.05	4.19	4.00	3.99	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	200/1384	4.85	4.64	4.10	4.12	4.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	218/1378	4.92	4.61	4.29	4.30	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	344/1378	4.85	4.72	4.31	4.33	4.85
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	3	2	8	4.38	300/ 904	4.38	4.17	4.03	4.03	4.38
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 239	****	****	4.21	3.99	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 87	****	5.00	4.65	4.30	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 75	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.45	3.68	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	3.97	3.76	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	4.44	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.19	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	3.33	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 9		
				? 1			



Course-Section: GWST 352H 0101  
 Title GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO  
 Instructor: BENVENGA, MICHE  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 914  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.24	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.18	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1566	5.00	4.41	4.07	4.04	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.40	4.12	4.07	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	361/1650	4.67	4.37	4.22	4.12	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.39	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	278/1626	4.67	4.29	4.11	4.06	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.31	4.46	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.24	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1323	5.00	4.19	4.00	3.99	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.72	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 904	5.00	4.17	4.03	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GWST 480 0101  
 Title THEORIES OF FEMINISM  
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 915  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	312/1666	4.75	4.37	4.27	4.35	4.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.37	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1566	4.75	4.41	4.07	4.17	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	221/1528	4.75	4.40	4.12	4.26	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.39	4.67	4.73	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	403/1626	4.50	4.29	4.11	4.28	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	896/1559	4.50	4.31	4.46	4.58	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	683/1549	4.50	4.59	4.31	4.43	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.43	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.32	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1193/1378	3.50	4.61	4.29	4.55	3.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	439/1378	4.75	4.72	4.31	4.60	4.75	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GWST 495 0101  
 Title COLLOQUIUM: RES & ACTV  
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2008

Page 916  
 AUG 6, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.45	4.31	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1406	5.00	4.54	4.32	4.48	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1615	5.00	4.46	4.24	4.37	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	187/1566	4.80	4.41	4.07	4.17	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1528	5.00	4.40	4.12	4.26	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1650	5.00	4.37	4.22	4.28	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	922/1667	4.75	4.39	4.67	4.73	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1626	5.00	4.29	4.11	4.28	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.31	4.46	4.58	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.91	4.72	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1549	5.00	4.59	4.31	4.43	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1546	5.00	4.58	4.32	4.43	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1323	****	4.19	4.00	4.10	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.64	4.10	4.32	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.61	4.29	4.55	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	5.00	4.72	4.31	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.17	4.03	4.22	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 87	5.00	5.00	4.65	4.80	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.60	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 75	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.56	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.45	4.53	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	3.97	3.67	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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