

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      | 4           | 0  | 0 | 3 | 6 | 23 | 41 | 4.40 | 780/1674   | 4.40 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.07 | 4.40  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 58 | 4.77 | 259/1674   | 4.77 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.16 | 4.77  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 62 | 4.85 | 174/1423   | 4.85 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.16 | 4.85  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 5           | 39 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4  | 26 | 4.64 | 343/1609   | 4.64 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.05 | 4.64  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 4           | 6  | 2 | 3 | 9 | 17 | 36 | 4.22 | 584/1585   | 4.22 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 3.88 | 4.22  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 7           | 56 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 10 | 4.21 | ****/1535  | **** | 4.15   | 4.08 | 3.89 | ****  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 4           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7  | 58 | 4.67 | 319/1651   | 4.67 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.10 | 4.67  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 5           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 55 | 15 | 4.20 | 1463/1673  | 4.20 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.20  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 17          | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 24 | 33 | 4.49 | 395/1656   | 4.49 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 3.96 | 4.49  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 55 | 4.75 | 517/1586   | 4.75 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.37 | 4.75  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5  | 67 | 4.90 | 567/1585   | 4.90 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.60 | 4.90  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 5           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 55 | 4.76 | 299/1582   | 4.76 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.17 | 4.76  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 4           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 58 | 4.74 | 391/1575   | 4.74 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.17 | 4.74  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 6           | 29 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 23 | 4.31 | 447/1380   | 4.31 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.78 | 4.31  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 40          | 0  | 1 | 5 | 4 | 5  | 22 | 4.14 | 751/1520   | 4.14 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 3.76 | 4.14  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 40          | 0  | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4  | 26 | 4.41 | 759/1515   | 4.41 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 3.97 | 4.41  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 40          | 0  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5  | 26 | 4.46 | 696/1511   | 4.46 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.00 | 4.46  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 41          | 24 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2  | 8  | 4.33 | ****/ 994  | **** | 3.98   | 3.94 | 3.73 | ****  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 74          | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 265  | **** | ****   | 4.23 | 3.97 | ****  |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 76          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 278  | **** | ****   | 4.19 | 3.97 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 260  | **** | ****   | 4.46 | 4.41 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance              | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 259  | **** | ****   | 4.33 | 4.19 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified    | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 233  | **** | ****   | 4.20 | 4.00 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 74          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2  | 5.00 | ****/ 103  | **** | ****   | 4.41 | 4.33 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 74          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2  | 5.00 | ****/ 101  | **** | ****   | 4.48 | 4.18 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 74          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2  | 5.00 | ****/ 95   | **** | ****   | 4.31 | 3.99 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 74          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2  | 5.00 | ****/ 99   | **** | ****   | 4.39 | 4.10 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 74          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2  | 5.00 | ****/ 97   | **** | ****   | 4.14 | 3.69 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 76          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 76   | **** | ****   | 3.98 | 3.32 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 76          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 77   | **** | ****   | 3.93 | 3.42 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 53   | **** | ****   | 4.45 | 4.34 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 48   | **** | ****   | 4.12 | 4.00 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 49   | **** | ****   | 4.27 | 4.30 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 76          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 61   | **** | ****   | 4.09 | 3.87 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | ****   | 4.26 | 3.91 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 50   | **** | ****   | 4.44 | 4.39 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 35   | **** | ****   | 4.36 | 3.92 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 75          | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 31   | **** | ****   | 4.34 | 3.88 | ****  |      |

Course-Section: MLL 190 0101  
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE  
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY  
 Enrollment: 200  
 Questionnaires: 77

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1175  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |    | Cum. GPA  |    | Expected Grades |    | Reasons             | Type | Majors  |    |           |    |
|----------------|----|-----------|----|-----------------|----|---------------------|------|---|----|-----------|----|
| 00-27          | 2  | 0.00-0.99 | 0  | A               | 51 | Required for Majors | 27   | Graduate  | 1  | Major     | 0  |
| 28-55          | 5  | 1.00-1.99 | 1  | B               | 13 |                     |      |   |    |           |    |
| 56-83          | 10 | 2.00-2.99 | 4  | C               | 0  | General             | 8    | Under-grad  | 76 | Non-major | 34 |
| 84-150         | 20 | 3.00-3.49 | 15 | D               | 0  |                     |      |   |    |           |    |
| Grad.          | 1  | 3.50-4.00 | 14 | F               | 0  | Electives           | 6    | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |    |
|                |    |           |    | P               | 0  |                     |      |   |    |           |    |
|                |    |           |    | I               | 0  | Other               | 25   |   |    |           |    |
|                |    |           |    | ?               | 1  |                     |      |   |    |           |    |

Course-Section: MLL 230 0101  
 Title: WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES  
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1176  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6  | 23 | 4.30 | 903/1674   | 4.30 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.30  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 17 | 4.27 | 906/1674   | 4.27 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.27  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 1  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6  | 27 | 4.61 | 445/1423   | 4.61 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.61  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 5  | 4 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 3.68 | 1371/1609  | 3.68 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.68  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8  | 20 | 4.11 | 692/1585   | 4.11 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 3.91 | 4.11  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 5  | 2 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 9  | 3.71 | 1185/1535  | 3.71 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.03 | 3.71  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5  | 26 | 4.41 | 673/1651   | 4.41 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.41  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 34 | 4.94 | 424/1673   | 4.94 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.94  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 23 | 6  | 4.03 | 936/1656   | 3.98 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.10 | 3.98  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5  | 26 | 4.63 | 723/1586   | 4.56 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.56  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 6  | 27 | 4.67 | 1071/1585  | 4.73 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.76 | 4.73  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 22 | 4.39 | 798/1582   | 4.45 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.45  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 2           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 9  | 20 | 4.31 | 905/1575   | 4.39 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.39 | 4.39  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 4  | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7  | 16 | 4.13 | 603/1380   | 4.16 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.03 | 4.16  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 12          | 0  | 2 | 1 | 5 | 6  | 11 | 3.92 | 901/1520   | 3.92 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.03 | 3.92  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 12          | 0  | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5  | 15 | 4.28 | 873/1515   | 4.28 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.28 | 4.28  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 19 | 4.76 | 402/1511   | 4.76 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.76  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 13          | 2  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 5  | 8  | 3.82 | 609/ 994   | 3.82 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 3.98 | 3.82  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 35          | 1  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 1.00 | ****/ 265  | **** | ****   | 4.23 | 4.34 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 260  | **** | ****   | 4.46 | 4.51 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 95   | **** | ****   | 4.31 | 4.33 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 76   | **** | ****   | 3.98 | 3.97 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 77   | **** | ****   | 3.93 | 4.20 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 35          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 2.50 | ****/ 53   | **** | ****   | 4.45 | 4.50 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 61   | **** | ****   | 4.09 | 4.23 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | ****   | 4.26 | 4.53 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 35          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 1  | 4.50 | ****/ 50   | **** | ****   | 4.44 | 4.42 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 35   | **** | ****   | 4.36 | 4.63 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 31   | **** | ****   | 4.34 | 4.50 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type                | Majors  |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27          | 4        | 0.00-0.99 0     | A 28    | Required for Majors | 0   |
| 28-55          | 5        | 1.00-1.99 1     | B 7     |                     | Graduate 0  |
| 56-83          | 5        | 2.00-2.99 1     | C 0     | General             | 2   |
| 84-150         | 3        | 3.00-3.49 2     | D 0     |                     | Under-grad 37   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00 16    | F 0     | Electives           | 2   |
|                |          |                 | P 0     |                     | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
|                |          |                 | I 0     | Other               | 31  |



Course-Section: MLL 230 0101  
 Title: WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES  
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 61  
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1177  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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  | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6  | 23 | 4.30 | 903/1674   | 4.30 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.30  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 16 | 17 | 4.27 | 906/1674   | 4.27 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.27  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 1  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6  | 27 | 4.61 | 445/1423   | 4.61 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.61  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 5  | 4 | 1 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 3.68 | 1371/1609  | 3.68 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.23 | 3.68  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8  | 20 | 4.11 | 692/1585   | 4.11 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 3.91 | 4.11  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 5  | 2 | 3 | 6 | 11 | 9  | 3.71 | 1185/1535  | 3.71 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.03 | 3.71  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5  | 26 | 4.41 | 673/1651   | 4.41 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.41  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 34 | 4.94 | 424/1673   | 4.94 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.94  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 8 | 13 | 8  | 3.93 | 1073/1656  | 3.98 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.10 | 3.98  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 9           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6  | 18 | 4.50 | 858/1586   | 4.56 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.56  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4  | 24 | 4.79 | 832/1585   | 4.73 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.76 | 4.73  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8  | 18 | 4.52 | 621/1582   | 4.45 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.45  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 9           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8  | 17 | 4.46 | 742/1575   | 4.39 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.39 | 4.39  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 7           | 3  | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6  | 14 | 4.19 | 549/1380   | 4.16 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.03 | 4.16  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 12          | 0  | 2 | 1 | 5 | 6  | 11 | 3.92 | 901/1520   | 3.92 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.03 | 3.92  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 12          | 0  | 0 | 3 | 2 | 5  | 15 | 4.28 | 873/1515   | 4.28 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.28 | 4.28  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 12          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6  | 19 | 4.76 | 402/1511   | 4.76 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.76  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 13          | 2  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 5  | 8  | 3.82 | 609/ 994   | 3.82 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 3.98 | 3.82  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material     | 35          | 1  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 1.00 | ****/ 265  | **** | ****   | 4.23 | 4.34 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities  | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 260  | **** | ****   | 4.46 | 4.51 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 5.00 | ****/ 95   | **** | ****   | 4.31 | 4.33 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 76   | **** | ****   | 3.98 | 3.97 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 77   | **** | ****   | 3.93 | 4.20 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 35          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 2.50 | ****/ 53   | **** | ****   | 4.45 | 4.50 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 61   | **** | ****   | 4.09 | 4.23 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | ****   | 4.26 | 4.53 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 35          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 1  | 4.50 | ****/ 50   | **** | ****   | 4.44 | 4.42 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 35   | **** | ****   | 4.36 | 4.63 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 36          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 31   | **** | ****   | 4.34 | 4.50 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |    |   |    |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|----|---|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 4        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A    | 28     | Required for Majors | 0  | Graduate  | 0  | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 5        | 1.00-1.99       | 1       | B    | 7      |                     |    |   |    |           |   |
| 56-83          | 5        | 2.00-2.99       | 1       | C    | 0      | General             | 2  | Under-grad  | 37 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150         | 3        | 3.00-3.49       | 2       | D    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00       | 16      | F    | 0      | Electives           | 2  | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |    |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |    |   |    |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 31 |   |    |           |   |



Course-Section: MLL 234 0101  
 Title CULT/VALUES THRU ART I  
 Instructor: BAKER, ELIZABET  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1178  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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 | 1 | 1 | 4  | 14 | 4.55 | 546/1674   | 4.55 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.55  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6  | 10 | 4.30 | 870/1674   | 4.30 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.30  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 5  | 4.57 | 493/1423   | 4.57 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.57  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8  | 12 | 4.60 | 374/1609   | 4.60 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.60  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 7 | 6  | 4  | 3.45 | 1260/1585  | 3.45 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 3.91 | 3.45  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 9  | 4.40 | 508/1535   | 4.40 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.03 | 4.40  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 6 | 8  | 5  | 3.85 | 1258/1651  | 3.85 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.20 | 3.85  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 20 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 11 | 5  | 4.11 | 894/1656   | 4.11 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.10 | 4.11  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 10 | 4.45 | 945/1586   | 4.45 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.45  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 19 | 4.95 | 340/1585   | 4.95 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.76 | 4.95  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 9  | 4.40 | 777/1582   | 4.40 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.40  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 10 | 4.45 | 768/1575   | 4.45 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.39 | 4.45  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9  | 5  | 4.12 | 612/1380   | 4.12 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.03 | 4.12  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2  | 6  | 4.40 | 512/1520   | 4.40 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.03 | 4.40  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 9  | 4.90 | 207/1515   | 4.90 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.28 | 4.90  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 10          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 9  | 4.90 | 244/1511   | 4.90 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.90  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 10          | 1  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4  | 2  | 3.67 | 676/ 994   | 3.67 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 3.98 | 3.67  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 270 0101  
 Title RUSSIAN CULTURE/CIVIL  
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1179  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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      | 4           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4  | 11 | 4.47 | 655/1674   | 4.47 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.32 | 4.47  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4  | 12 | 4.47 | 625/1674   | 4.47 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.47  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 2           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5  | 12 | 4.47 | 611/1423   | 4.47 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.47  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4  | 13 | 4.58 | 408/1609   | 4.58 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.23 | 4.58  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2  | 13 | 4.59 | 277/1585   | 4.59 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 3.91 | 4.59  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3  | 13 | 4.61 | 275/1535   | 4.61 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.03 | 4.61  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 4           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6  | 8  | 4.18 | 956/1651   | 4.18 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.20 | 4.18  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 3           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 7  | 4.28 | 1405/1673  | 4.28 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.28  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 7  | 4.50 | 381/1656   | 4.50 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.10 | 4.50  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1  | 15 | 4.82 | 354/1586   | 4.82 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.48 | 4.82  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2  | 14 | 4.76 | 896/1585   | 4.76 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.76 | 4.76  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4  | 12 | 4.65 | 467/1582   | 4.65 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.35 | 4.65  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 4           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 15 | 4.76 | 343/1575   | 4.76 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.39 | 4.76  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 4           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3  | 13 | 4.65 | 213/1380   | 4.65 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.03 | 4.65  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6  | 5  | 4.23 | 663/1520   | 4.23 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.03 | 4.23  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 8           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5  | 8  | 4.62 | 533/1515   | 4.62 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.28 | 4.62  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 7           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3  | 10 | 4.64 | 525/1511   | 4.64 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.64  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 7           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5  | 7  | 4.46 | 237/ 994   | 4.46 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 3.98 | 4.46  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20          | 0  | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 1.00 | ****/ 278  | **** | ****   | 4.19 | 4.36 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 19          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 1  | 3.50 | ****/ 103  | **** | ****   | 4.41 | 4.07 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 19          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 101  | **** | ****   | 4.48 | 4.45 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 19          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 95   | **** | ****   | 4.31 | 4.33 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 19          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 99   | **** | ****   | 4.39 | 4.22 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 19          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 1  | 4.00 | ****/ 97   | **** | ****   | 4.14 | 4.63 | ****  |      |
| Field Work  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned    | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 76   | **** | ****   | 3.98 | 3.97 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria    | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 77   | **** | ****   | 3.93 | 4.20 | ****  |      |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation          | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 53   | **** | ****   | 4.45 | 4.50 | ****  |      |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations      | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 48   | **** | ****   | 4.12 | 4.50 | ****  |      |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities    | 20          | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 2.00 | ****/ 49   | **** | ****   | 4.27 | 4.82 | ****  |      |
| Self Paced  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned   | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 61   | **** | ****   | 4.09 | 4.23 | ****  |      |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal       | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 52   | **** | ****   | 4.26 | 4.53 | ****  |      |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful         | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 50   | **** | ****   | 4.44 | 4.42 | ****  |      |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful          | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 35   | **** | ****   | 4.36 | 4.63 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students        | 20          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 31   | **** | ****   | 4.34 | 4.50 | ****  |      |



Course-Section: MLL 270 0101  
 Title RUSSIAN CULTURE/CIVIL  
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE  
 Enrollment: 33  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1179  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 322 0101  
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA  
 Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1180  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5  | 17 | 4.25 | 954/1674   | 4.01 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.25  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 3 | 2 | 9  | 14 | 4.21 | 980/1674   | 3.83 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.21 | 4.21  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 4  | 4.60 | ****/1423  | **** | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.27 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5  | 19 | 4.56 | 432/1609   | 4.05 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.56  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 1  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6  | 15 | 4.22 | 584/1585   | 4.19 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 3.95 | 4.22  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 17 | 4.54 | 346/1535   | 4.16 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.15 | 4.54  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7  | 9  | 3.43 | 1476/1651  | 3.37 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.16 | 3.43  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8  | 20 | 4.71 | 1015/1673  | 4.86 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.71  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 4.30 | 667/1656   | 3.92 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.07 | 4.30  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 5           | 0  | 2 | 3 | 1 | 8  | 9  | 3.83 | 1394/1586  | 3.93 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.42 | 3.83  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4  | 20 | 4.83 | 737/1585   | 4.74 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.83  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 4           | 0  | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5  | 12 | 3.96 | 1173/1582  | 3.96 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.26 | 3.96  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 4           | 0  | 2 | 0 | 4 | 3  | 15 | 4.21 | 1001/1575  | 4.06 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.25 | 4.21  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 3           | 2  | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7  | 12 | 4.35 | 419/1380   | 3.84 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.35  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7  | 15 | 4.68 | 281/1520   | 4.30 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.68  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 6           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3  | 18 | 4.73 | 420/1515   | 4.55 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.32 | 4.73  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 6           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 21 | 4.95 | 122/1511   | 4.64 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.95  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 6           | 1  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 10 | 4.29 | 346/ 994   | 3.73 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.29  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type                   | Majors  |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------------------------|---|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99 0     | A 15    | Required for Majors 10 | Graduate 0 Major 0  |
| 28-55          | 2        | 1.00-1.99 0     | B 11    |                        |   |
| 56-83          | 12       | 2.00-2.99 3     | C 0     | General 6              | Under-grad 28 Non-major 3                                     |
| 84-150         | 4        | 3.00-3.49 5     | D 0     |                        |   |
| Grad.          | 0        | 3.50-4.00 9     | F 0     | Electives 1            | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
|                |          |                 | P 0     |                        |   |
|                |          |                 | I 0     | Other 10               |   |
|                |          |                 | ? 1     |                        |   |

Course-Section: MLL 322 0201  
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA  
 Instructor: HAGOVSKY, ELIZA  
 Enrollment: 38  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1181  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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  | 1 | 2 | 4 | 13 | 5  | 3.76 | 1402/1674  | 4.01 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.26 | 3.76  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5  | 7  | 3.44 | 1523/1674  | 3.83 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.21 | 3.44  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 20 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1  | 1  | 3.40 | ****/1423  | **** | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.27 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 3  | 1 | 3 | 7 | 5  | 6  | 3.55 | 1435/1609  | 4.05 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.27 | 3.55  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6  | 13 | 4.16 | 642/1585   | 4.19 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 3.95 | 4.16  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 1  | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6  | 9  | 3.79 | 1117/1535  | 4.16 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.15 | 3.79  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 3 | 3 | 7 | 7  | 5  | 3.32 | 1507/1651  | 3.37 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.16 | 3.32  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 24 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 4.86 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.68 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 7 | 11 | 2  | 3.55 | 1358/1656  | 3.92 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.07 | 3.55  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 2           | 0  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 8  | 10 | 4.04 | 1280/1586  | 3.93 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.04  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4  | 17 | 4.65 | 1083/1585  | 4.74 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.65  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4  | 10 | 3.96 | 1173/1582  | 3.96 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.26 | 3.96  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 3           | 0  | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5  | 9  | 3.91 | 1216/1575  | 4.06 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.25 | 3.91  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 2           | 8  | 0 | 6 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 3.33 | 1127/1380  | 3.84 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.01 | 3.33  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5  | 11 | 3.92 | 912/1520   | 4.30 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.09 | 3.92  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8  | 13 | 4.38 | 788/1515   | 4.55 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.32 | 4.38  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 1           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8  | 13 | 4.33 | 816/1511   | 4.64 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.33  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 1           | 0  | 4 | 2 | 8 | 6  | 4  | 3.17 | 857/ 994   | 3.73 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.17  |      |
| Laboratory  |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 24          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 278  | **** | ****   | 4.19 | 4.24 | ****  |      |
| Seminar   |             |    |   |   |   |    |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme   | 24          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 103  | **** | ****   | 4.41 | 4.10 | ****  |      |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  | 24          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 101  | **** | ****   | 4.48 | 4.30 | ****  |      |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned   | 24          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 95   | **** | ****   | 4.31 | 3.91 | ****  |      |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned       | 24          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0  | 4.00 | ****/ 99   | **** | ****   | 4.39 | 4.29 | ****  |      |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                   | 24          | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0  | 0  | 3.00 | ****/ 97   | **** | ****   | 4.14 | 3.48 | ****  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors                |   |             |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|-----------------------|---|-------------|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 0       | A 14 | Required for Majors 4 | Graduate 1  | Major 0     |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B 6  |                       |   |             |
| 56-83          | 3        | 2.00-2.99       | 2       | C 2  | General 12            | Under-grad 24   | Non-major 3 |
| 84-150         | 10       | 3.00-3.49       | 7       | D 0  |                       |   |             |
| Grad.          | 1        | 3.50-4.00       | 8       | F 0  | Electives 2           | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |             |
|                |          |                 |         | P 0  |                       |   |             |
|                |          |                 |         | I 0  | Other 7               |   |             |
|                |          |                 |         | ? 2  |                       |   |             |

Course-Section: MLL 328 0101  
 Title CHINESE FICTION & DRAM  
 Instructor: BROWN, WILLIAM  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1182  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 4.67 | 406/1674   | 4.67 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.26 | 4.67  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4.50 | 578/1674   | 4.50 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.21 | 4.50  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 4.78 | 238/1423   | 4.78 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.78  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4.44 | 583/1609   | 4.44 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.44  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94 | 52/1585    | 4.94 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 3.95 | 4.94  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1           | 3  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 6  | 4.29 | 631/1535   | 4.29 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.15 | 4.29  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.71 | 288/1651   | 4.71 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.16 | 4.71  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 16 | 4.94 | 424/1673   | 4.94 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.68 | 4.94  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9  | 4.64 | 274/1656   | 4.64 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.07 | 4.64  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 4.78 | 453/1586   | 4.78 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.42 | 4.78  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.89 | 615/1585   | 4.89 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.66 | 4.89  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 4.72 | 353/1582   | 4.72 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.72  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 4.78 | 327/1575   | 4.78 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.25 | 4.78  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 7  | 4.06 | 644/1380   | 4.06 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 4.01 | 4.06  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 6  | 4.21 | 682/1520   | 4.21 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.09 | 4.21  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9  | 4.57 | 568/1515   | 4.57 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.32 | 4.57  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.71 | 458/1511   | 4.71 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.71  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 4           | 7  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1  | 3.71 | 657/ 994   | 3.71 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.71  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 603 0101  
 Title POLI ECONOMY OF CULTUR  
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1183  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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 | 1/1674     | 5.00 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 379/1674   | 4.67 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.67  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | 1173/1423  | 3.75 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.75  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 852/1609   | 4.25 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 4.25  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 326/1585   | 4.50 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.50  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 667/1535   | 4.25 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.25  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 866/1651   | 4.25 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.25  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 958/1673   | 4.75 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.75  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | 1540/1656  | 4.00 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 4.00  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 1074/1586  | 4.67 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.67  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4.33 | 1354/1585  | 4.67 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.67  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4.33 | 850/1582   | 4.67 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.67  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 495/1575   | 4.83 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.83  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.25 | 1160/1380  | 3.25 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 3.25  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 229/1520   | 4.75 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.75  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 629/1515   | 4.50 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.50  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 642/1511   | 4.50 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 0           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 474/ 994   | 4.00 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.00  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 603 0101  
 Title POLI ECONOMY OF CULTUR  
 Instructor: (Instr. C)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1184  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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 | 1/1674     | 5.00 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 379/1674   | 4.67 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.67  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | 1173/1423  | 3.75 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.75  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 852/1609   | 4.25 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 4.25  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 326/1585   | 4.50 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.50  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 667/1535   | 4.25 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.25  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 866/1651   | 4.25 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.25  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 958/1673   | 4.75 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.75  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 229/1520   | 4.75 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.75  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 629/1515   | 4.50 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.50  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 642/1511   | 4.50 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 0           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 474/ 994   | 4.00 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.00  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 1        | 0.00-0.99       | 1       | A    | 0      | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate  | 1 | 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  | 3 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | 0       | D    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 1        | 3.50-4.00       | 0       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 3 |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 2      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |

Course-Section: MLL 603 0101  
 Title POLI ECONOMY OF CULTUR  
 Instructor: (Instr. D)  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1185  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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 | 1/1674     | 5.00 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 379/1674   | 4.67 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.67  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3.75 | 1173/1423  | 3.75 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.75  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 852/1609   | 4.25 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 4.25  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 326/1585   | 4.50 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.50  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 4.25 | 667/1535   | 4.25 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.25  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4.25 | 866/1651   | 4.25 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.25  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 958/1673   | 4.75 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.75  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1656     | 4.00 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 4.00  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1586     | 4.67 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.67  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 3           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1575     | 4.83 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.83  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 229/1520   | 4.75 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.75  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 629/1515   | 4.50 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.50  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4.50 | 642/1511   | 4.50 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.50  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 0           | 1  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 474/ 994   | 4.00 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.00  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 1        | 0.00-0.99       | 1       | A    | 0      | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate  | 1 | 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  | 3 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | 0       | D    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 1        | 3.50-4.00       | 0       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 0 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 3 |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 2      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |

Course-Section: MLL 605 0101  
 Title FIELD OF INTERCULT COM  
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1186  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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 | 1 | 5 | 6  | 4.42 | 751/1674   | 4.42 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.42  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4  | 4.08 | 1090/1674  | 4.08 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.08  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 7  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1  | 3.00 | 1363/1423  | 3.00 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.00  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 2  | 3.75 | 1320/1609  | 3.75 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 3.75  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6  | 4.17 | 642/1585   | 4.17 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.17  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5  | 3.92 | 1006/1535  | 3.92 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 3.92  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7  | 4.42 | 658/1651   | 4.42 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.42  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 3  | 4.18 | 805/1656   | 4.18 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 4.18  |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5  | 4.18 | 1198/1586  | 4.18 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.18  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 567/1585   | 4.91 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.91  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3  | 3.91 | 1217/1582  | 3.91 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 3.91  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6  | 4.25 | 958/1575   | 4.25 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.25  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 1           | 5  | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0  | 2.67 | 1304/1380  | 2.67 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 2.67  |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |    |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7  | 4.45 | 454/1520   | 4.45 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.45  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7  | 4.55 | 594/1515   | 4.55 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.55  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 4.91 | 244/1511   | 4.91 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.91  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 1           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 2  | 4.10 | 445/ 994   | 4.10 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.10  |      |

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MLL 625 0101  
 Title INTER/CROSS-CULT COMMU  
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 1187  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 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 | 2 | 8 | 4.80 | 243/1674   | 4.80 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.80  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 519/1674   | 4.56 | 4.37   | 4.23 | 4.34 | 4.56  |      |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals      | 0           | 7  | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4.00 | 1016/1423  | 4.00 | 4.19   | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.00  |      |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       | 0           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.30 | 786/1609   | 4.30 | 4.19   | 4.22 | 4.34 | 4.30  |      |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned   | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 326/1585   | 4.50 | 4.31   | 3.96 | 4.23 | 4.50  |      |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 3           | 0  | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.14 | 787/1535   | 4.14 | 4.15   | 4.08 | 4.27 | 4.14  |      |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained               | 3           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 524/1651   | 4.50 | 4.20   | 4.18 | 4.32 | 4.50  |      |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                     | 4           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1673     | 5.00 | 4.79   | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00  |      |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1656     | 5.00 | 4.23   | 4.07 | 4.15 | 5.00  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| Lecture   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared           | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 453/1586   | 4.78 | 4.51   | 4.43 | 4.50 | 4.78  |      |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject      | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 615/1585   | 4.89 | 4.80   | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.89  |      |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly   | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.67 | 438/1582   | 4.67 | 4.44   | 4.26 | 4.33 | 4.67  |      |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned        | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 327/1575   | 4.78 | 4.53   | 4.27 | 4.30 | 4.78  |      |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  | 2           | 1  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4.29 | 463/1380   | 4.29 | 3.94   | 3.94 | 3.85 | 4.29  |      |
| -----   |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| Discussion  |             |    |   |   |   |   |   |      |            |      |        |      |      |       |      |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 4.80 | 191/1520   | 4.80 | 4.38   | 4.01 | 4.19 | 4.80  |      |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate   | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 207/1515   | 4.90 | 4.55   | 4.24 | 4.47 | 4.90  |      |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  | 0           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 244/1511   | 4.90 | 4.68   | 4.27 | 4.49 | 4.90  |      |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                     | 1           | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 107/ 994   | 4.78 | 3.98   | 3.94 | 4.07 | 4.78  |      |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|------|--------|---------------------|---|---|---|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 0        | 0.00-0.99       | 2       | A    | 9      | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate  | 7 | Major     | 0 |
| 28-55          | 0        | 1.00-1.99       | 0       | B    | 1      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| 56-83          | 1        | 2.00-2.99       | 0       | C    | 0      | General             | 0 | Under-grad  | 3 | Non-major | 5 |
| 84-150         | 0        | 3.00-3.49       | 0       | D    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
| Grad.          | 7        | 3.50-4.00       | 4       | F    | 0      | Electives           | 1 | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | P    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | I    | 0      | Other               | 8 |   |   |           |   |
|                |          |                 |         | ?    | 0      |                     |   |   |   |           |   |