

Course-Section: LLC 635 0101
 Title SOC CULT LRNG THEOR
 Instructor: MAHER, JENNIFER
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 943
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	0	1	4	4.80	246/1522	4.80	4.94	4.30	4.45	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	935/1522	4.20	4.84	4.26	4.29	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	792/1476	4.25	4.82	4.22	4.31	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.81	4.06	4.25	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1016/1381	3.80	4.73	4.08	4.25	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	1147/1500	3.80	4.78	4.18	4.22	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1301/1517	4.20	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	385/1497	4.50	4.68	4.11	4.21	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1186/1440	4.00	4.74	4.45	4.48	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.90	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	876/1436	4.25	4.82	4.29	4.37	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	884/1432	4.25	4.76	4.29	4.33	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	1215/1221	1.33	3.70	3.93	3.83	1.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	718/1280	4.00	4.71	4.10	4.24	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	527/1277	4.60	4.84	4.34	4.52	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	4.50	4.02	4.08	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.90	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.95	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.90	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.95	4.11	4.38	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750A 0101
 Title LANG, RACE, & ETHNICIT
 Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 944
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	7	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.94	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	164/1522	4.86	4.84	4.26	4.29	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1285	****	****	4.30	4.31	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	151/1476	4.86	4.82	4.22	4.31	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.81	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1381	4.86	4.73	4.08	4.25	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	134/1500	4.86	4.78	4.18	4.22	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	654/1497	4.25	4.68	4.11	4.21	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	272/1440	4.86	4.74	4.45	4.48	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.90	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1436	4.86	4.82	4.29	4.37	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	558/1432	4.57	4.76	4.29	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	175/1221	4.67	3.70	3.93	3.83	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	566/1280	4.29	4.71	4.10	4.24	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	672/1277	4.43	4.84	4.34	4.52	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	756/1269	4.29	4.88	4.31	4.51	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	252/ 854	4.40	4.50	4.02	4.08	4.40	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.72	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 228	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.39	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	5.00	4.51	4.61	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 216	****	****	4.42	4.76	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 205	5.00	5.00	4.23	4.40	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	53/ 77	4.60	4.90	4.52	4.70	4.60	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	30/ 65	4.80	4.95	4.49	4.71	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	46/ 78	4.60	4.90	4.45	4.66	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 80	4.80	4.95	4.11	4.38	4.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 47	5.00	4.90	4.41	4.40	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	4.80	4.30	4.49	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 35	4.50	4.75	4.31	4.71	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.75	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.63	4.82	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.68	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	5.00	4.69	4.79	****	

Course-Section: LLC 750A 0101
 Title LANG, RACE, & ETHNICIT
 Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 944
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750B 0101
 Title CULT & DESIGN OF ICTS
 Instructor: YOUNG, PATRICIA (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 945
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.94	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.84	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.82	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.81	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.73	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.68	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.74	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.90	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.70	3.93	3.83	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.71	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.84	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.50	4.02	4.08	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.90	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.95	4.49	4.71	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.90	4.45	4.66	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.95	4.11	4.38	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.63	4.82	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.68	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.83	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 18	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.92	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750B 0101
 Title CULT & DESIGN OF ICTS
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 946
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.94	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.84	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.82	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.81	4.06	4.25	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.73	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.75	4.65	4.73	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1497	5.00	4.68	4.11	4.21	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.71	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.84	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.50	4.02	4.08	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.90	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.95	4.49	4.71	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.90	4.45	4.66	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.95	4.11	4.38	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	5.00	4.63	4.82	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 23	5.00	5.00	4.41	4.68	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 33	5.00	5.00	4.69	4.79	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 22	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.83	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 18	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.92	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750C 0101
 Title ADV QUALITATIVE RESEAR
 Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 947
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1	5	4.83	225/1522	4.83	4.94	4.30	4.45	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.84	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1476	4.83	4.82	4.22	4.31	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1412	4.80	4.81	4.06	4.25	4.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.73	4.08	4.25	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	714/1517	4.80	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.68	4.11	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	304/1440	4.83	4.74	4.45	4.48	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.90	4.71	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	279/1221	4.50	3.70	3.93	3.83	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.71	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.84	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	166/ 854	4.60	4.50	4.02	4.08	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	5.00	4.58	4.76	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	4.90	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.95	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.90	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.95	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 47	4.80	4.90	4.41	4.40	4.80	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	19/ 45	4.60	4.80	4.30	4.49	4.60	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.40	4.78	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.75	4.31	4.71	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	14/ 34	4.75	4.75	4.30	4.82	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 890 0101
 Title RES PROPOSAL SEMINAR
 Instructor: MALONEY-KRICHMA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 948
 JUN 26, 2007
 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	1/1522	5.00	4.94	4.30	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.84	4.26	4.29	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.82	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.81	4.06	4.25	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1381	4.75	4.73	4.08	4.25	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.78	4.18	4.22	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.75	4.65	4.73	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.67	4.68	4.11	4.21	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.74	4.45	4.48	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1157/1448	4.50	4.90	4.71	4.80	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.82	4.29	4.37	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.76	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.70	3.93	3.83	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.71	4.10	4.24	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.84	4.34	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.88	4.31	4.51	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.50	4.02	4.08	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	5.00	4.58	4.76	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 77	5.00	4.90	4.52	4.70	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.95	4.49	4.71	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 78	5.00	4.90	4.45	4.66	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.95	4.11	4.38	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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