

Course-Section: GWST 100 0101
 Title INTRO GENDER & WOMEN
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 908
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	0	0	4	4	14	4.45	712/1576	4.45	4.27	4.30	4.11	4.45	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	8	12	4.30	891/1576	4.30	4.34	4.27	4.18	4.30	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	18	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1342	****	4.52	4.32	4.19	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	9	11	4.36	731/1520	4.36	4.44	4.25	4.09	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	15	4.48	410/1465	4.48	4.41	4.12	4.02	4.48	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	330/1434	4.59	4.36	4.14	3.94	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	8	10	4.09	985/1547	4.09	4.39	4.19	4.10	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	20	2	4.09	1427/1574	4.09	4.53	4.64	4.59	4.09	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	3	7	4	3.93	1019/1554	3.93	4.09	4.10	4.01	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	1	0	3	14	4.47	907/1488	4.47	4.55	4.47	4.41	4.47	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	1	0	18	4.89	582/1493	4.89	4.84	4.73	4.65	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	514/1486	4.63	4.53	4.32	4.26	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	614/1489	4.58	4.50	4.32	4.22	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	4	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	668/1277	4.07	4.27	4.03	3.91	4.07	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	8	9	4.24	681/1279	4.24	4.43	4.17	3.96	4.24	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	1	2	4	13	4.29	814/1270	4.29	4.75	4.35	4.09	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	2	4	13	4.29	803/1269	4.29	4.80	4.35	4.09	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	1	0	7	4	5	3.71	660/ 878	3.71	3.97	4.05	3.91	3.71	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	3.78	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	7	Under-grad	23	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	7				
			? 2						

Course-Section: GWST 200 0101
 Title STUDIES IN FEM ACTIVIS
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 909
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	7	14	4.42	772/1576	4.42	4.27	4.30	4.35	4.42	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	13	4.29	900/1576	4.29	4.34	4.27	4.32	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	20	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1342	****	4.52	4.32	4.41	****		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	3	18	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.44	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	16	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.41	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	14	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.36	4.14	4.06	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	2	5	15	4.29	794/1547	4.29	4.39	4.19	4.22	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	972/1574	4.63	4.53	4.64	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	5	6	13	4.33	623/1554	4.33	4.09	4.10	4.05	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	6	3	10	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.55	4.47	4.44	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	683/1493	4.86	4.84	4.73	4.75	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	7	2	11	4.10	1072/1486	4.10	4.53	4.32	4.29	4.10	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	4	1	14	4.19	997/1489	4.19	4.50	4.32	4.31	4.19	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	3	2	11	4.22	560/1277	4.22	4.27	4.03	4.01	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	2	3	11	4.28	649/1279	4.28	4.43	4.17	4.14	4.28	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	1	15	4.61	550/1270	4.61	4.75	4.35	4.30	4.61	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	421/1269	4.78	4.80	4.35	4.29	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	9	4	0	1	3	1	2.67	843/ 878	2.67	3.97	4.05	3.92	2.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 24 Non-major 18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 15	
			? 2		

Course-Section: GWST 321 0101
 Title QUEER REPRSNT FILM & T
 Instructor: HOUSEHOLDER, AP
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 910
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	0	1	2	2	20	4.64	443/1576	4.64	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	1	4	18	4.52	581/1576	4.52	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	4	17	4.48	608/1342	4.48	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	4	17	4.44	614/1520	4.44	4.44	4.25	4.25	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	4	18	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.41	4.12	4.09	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	6	15	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.36	4.14	4.15	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	1	4	19	4.60	411/1547	4.60	4.39	4.19	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	1033/1574	4.57	4.53	4.64	4.61	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	463/1554	4.45	4.09	4.10	4.09	4.45
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	223/1488	4.92	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	734/1493	4.83	4.84	4.73	4.70	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	2	21	4.79	322/1489	4.79	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	2	20	4.67	215/1277	4.67	4.27	4.03	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.43	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	326/1270	4.83	4.75	4.35	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	250/1269	4.92	4.80	4.35	4.41	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	193/ 878	4.58	3.97	4.05	4.09	4.58

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	11	Under-grad	26	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: GWST 322 0101
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, RACHE
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 911
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	0	2	3.80	1325/1576	4.00	4.27	4.30	4.30	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	476/1576	4.06	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	480/1342	4.20	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	1041/1520	3.90	4.44	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	708/1465	4.08	4.41	4.12	4.09	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1263/1434	3.55	4.36	4.14	4.15	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	900/1547	3.60	4.39	4.19	4.21	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1367/1574	4.06	4.53	4.64	4.61	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	924/1554	3.85	4.09	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	750/1488	4.03	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1493	4.69	4.84	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	821/1486	4.03	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	997/1489	3.94	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	585/1277	4.22	4.27	4.03	4.11	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	802/1279	4.09	4.43	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	4.67	4.75	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	4.66	4.80	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.09	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: GWST 322 0201
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: WILLIAMS, RACHE
 Enrollment: 39
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 912
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	0	1	4	10	11	4.19	1019/1576	4.00	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	7	5	9	3.52	1389/1576	4.06	4.34	4.27	4.28	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	9	3	11	3.81	1110/1342	4.20	4.52	4.32	4.30	3.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	4	7	10	3.81	1232/1520	3.90	4.44	4.25	4.25	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	10	4	11	3.96	905/1465	4.08	4.41	4.12	4.09	3.96	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	9	6	8	3.69	1127/1434	3.55	4.36	4.14	4.15	3.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	3	7	6	3	5	3.00	1459/1547	3.60	4.39	4.19	4.21	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	1	3	18	3	3.92	1509/1574	4.06	4.53	4.64	4.61	3.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	9	12	4	3.69	1207/1554	3.85	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	2	2	7	6	5	3.45	1397/1488	4.03	4.55	4.47	4.47	3.45	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	3	4	13	4.38	1296/1493	4.69	4.84	4.73	4.70	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	7	7	6	3.65	1290/1486	4.03	4.53	4.32	4.32	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	8	3	8	3.68	1278/1489	3.94	4.50	4.32	4.34	3.68	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	2	0	3	2	14	4.24	551/1277	4.22	4.27	4.03	4.11	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	3	3	9	4.19	719/1279	4.09	4.43	4.17	4.20	4.19	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	4	2	9	4.33	784/1270	4.67	4.75	4.35	4.42	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	2	3	10	4.31	786/1269	4.66	4.80	4.35	4.41	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	6	5	4	3.87	575/ 878	4.18	3.97	4.05	4.09	3.87	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 9		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 10	Under-grad 27 Non-major 27
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GWST 338 0101
 Title WOMEN AND LAW
 Instructor: WELLER, KRIS
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 913
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	0	1	6	4	8	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	4	9	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	562/1342	4.53	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	2	4	10	4.11	994/1520	4.11	4.44	4.25	4.25	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	3	10	3.95	933/1465	3.95	4.41	4.12	4.09	3.95	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	7	10	4.20	748/1434	4.20	4.36	4.14	4.15	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	5	10	4.16	932/1547	4.16	4.39	4.19	4.21	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	795/1574	4.74	4.53	4.64	4.61	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	1	8	3	1	3.31	1375/1554	3.31	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	5	4	10	4.15	1176/1488	4.15	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	1	1	17	4.65	1065/1493	4.65	4.84	4.73	4.70	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	9	4.15	1032/1486	4.15	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	2	12	4.05	1091/1489	4.05	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	337/1277	4.47	4.27	4.03	4.11	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	5	2	7	3.88	910/1279	3.88	4.43	4.17	4.20	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	589/1270	4.56	4.75	4.35	4.42	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	567/1269	4.63	4.80	4.35	4.41	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	9	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	788/ 878	3.14	3.97	4.05	4.09	3.14	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 20 Non-major 18
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 2	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 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GWST 340 0101
 Title GLOBAL PRSP ON GENDER
 Instructor: ERGUN, EMEK
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 914
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.27	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	222/1576	4.80	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1342	****	4.52	4.32	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	96/1520	4.93	4.44	4.25	4.25	4.93	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	85/1465	4.93	4.41	4.12	4.09	4.93	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.36	4.14	4.15	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	207/1547	4.79	4.39	4.19	4.21	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.53	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	363/1554	4.55	4.09	4.10	4.09	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	324/1488	4.86	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	2	1	6	4.10	653/1277	4.10	4.27	4.03	4.11	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	335/1279	4.67	4.43	4.17	4.20	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.75	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	250/1269	4.92	4.80	4.35	4.41	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	1	1	0	4	1	3.43	735/ 878	3.43	3.97	4.05	4.09	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	4	Under-grad	15	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	7				
			? 0						

Course-Section: GWST 352 0101
 Title GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO
 Instructor: BENVENGA, MICHE
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 915
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	5	16	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	683/1576	4.46	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	455/1342	4.63	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	218/1520	4.78	4.44	4.25	4.25	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	17	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.41	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	279/1434	4.65	4.36	4.14	4.15	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	4	16	4.52	503/1547	4.52	4.39	4.19	4.21	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	422/1574	4.92	4.53	4.64	4.61	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	331/1554	4.59	4.09	4.10	4.09	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	248/1488	4.91	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	240/1489	4.86	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	3	4	12	4.19	585/1277	4.19	4.27	4.03	4.11	4.19	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	101/1279	4.94	4.43	4.17	4.20	4.94	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	156/1270	4.94	4.75	4.35	4.42	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	167/1269	4.94	4.80	4.35	4.41	4.94	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	171/ 878	4.65	3.97	4.05	4.09	4.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	****	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	****	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	****	5.00	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	****	****	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 382	****	****	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: GWST 352 0101
 Title GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO
 Instructor: BENVENGA, MICHE
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 915
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	19	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	9	Under-grad	24	Non-major	22
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GWST 352H 0101
 Title GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO
 Instructor: BENVENGA, MICHE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 916
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.27	4.30	4.30	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.44	4.25	4.25	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.41	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.36	4.14	4.15	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.39	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1079/1574	4.50	4.53	4.64	4.61	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.09	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.55	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	692/1277	4.00	4.27	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.43	4.17	4.20	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.75	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.80	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	3.97	4.05	4.09	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	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 2 Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: GWST 390B 0101
 Title GENDER & THE ENVIRONME
 Instructor: STUPSKI, KAREN
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 917
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	916/1576	4.29	4.27	4.30	4.30	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	978/1576	4.21	4.34	4.27	4.28	4.21	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	7	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	510/1342	4.57	4.52	4.32	4.30	4.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	648/1520	4.43	4.44	4.25	4.25	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.41	4.12	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	287/1434	4.64	4.36	4.14	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	207/1547	4.79	4.39	4.19	4.21	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574	4.77	4.53	4.64	4.61	4.77	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1060/1554	3.91	4.09	4.10	4.09	3.91	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	666/1488	4.67	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	0	10	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.84	4.73	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.53	4.32	4.32	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.50	4.32	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	268/1277	4.58	4.27	4.03	4.11	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.43	4.17	4.20	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.75	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.80	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	415/ 878	4.17	3.97	4.05	4.09	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	****	4.23	4.24	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.83	4.72	4.67	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.48	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.60	4.83	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 0		

Course-Section: GWST 495 0101
 Title COLLOQUIUM: RES & ACTV
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 918
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	6	4.71	347/1576	4.71	4.27	4.30	4.46	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.27	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.52	4.32	4.46	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.44	4.25	4.38	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	483/1465	4.43	4.41	4.12	4.22	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.36	4.14	4.30	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	154/1547	4.86	4.39	4.19	4.24	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.53	4.64	4.69	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	772/1554	4.20	4.09	4.10	4.24	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.55	4.47	4.55	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.84	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.53	4.32	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.50	4.32	4.38	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1277	****	4.27	4.03	4.04	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.43	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.75	4.35	4.53	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.80	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	3.97	4.05	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	52/ 85	4.83	4.83	4.72	4.77	4.83	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.69	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	5.00	4.64	4.64	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.52	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	5.00	4.01	3.90	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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