

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	3	2	3	6	13	3.89	1300/1669	4.39	4.33	4.23	4.02	3.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	1	7	15	4.15	1001/1666	4.52	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	5	16	4.22	839/1421	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	6	2	0	4	4	10	4.00	1029/1617	4.32	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	4	2	6	13	3.89	955/1555	4.24	4.17	4.00	3.92	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	7	5	2	2	5	6	3.25	1344/1543	3.75	4.19	4.06	3.86	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	7	16	4.41	651/1647	4.46	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	1030/1668	4.85	4.60	4.67	4.62	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	9	9	2	3.65	1280/1605	4.22	4.13	4.07	3.96	3.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	1	4	8	11	4.08	1177/1514	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	1	2	6	14	4.29	1322/1551	4.65	4.72	4.66	4.55	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	2	0	4	10	7	3.87	1184/1503	4.34	4.31	4.24	4.17	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	5	2	13	3.92	1163/1506	4.41	4.40	4.26	4.17	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	2	0	6	7	4	3.58	904/1311	4.16	3.78	3.85	3.68	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	1	2	3	4	8	3.89	965/1490	4.15	4.26	4.05	3.85	3.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	2	3	13	4.42	729/1502	4.56	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	1013/1489	4.44	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.11	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	13	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	B 7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 6	General	4	Under-grad	28	Non-major	22
84-150	4	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	12				
			? 1						

Course Section: MLL 190 0201
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T
 Enrollment: 48
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1157
 JAN 18, 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	2	0	0	1	0	1	33	4.89	143/1669	4.39	4.33	4.23	4.02	4.89	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	4	31	4.89	118/1666	4.52	4.28	4.19	4.11	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	32	4.91	136/1421	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.11	4.91	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	7	0	0	2	6	20	4.64	347/1617	4.32	4.27	4.15	3.99	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	10	23	4.60	262/1555	4.24	4.17	4.00	3.92	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	3	1	1	6	5	19	4.25	659/1543	3.75	4.19	4.06	3.86	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	8	23	4.51	469/1647	4.46	4.18	4.12	4.06	4.51	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	35	5.00	1/1668	4.85	4.60	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	7	25	4.78	151/1605	4.22	4.13	4.07	3.96	4.78	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	31	4.94	132/1514	4.51	4.39	4.39	4.32	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1551	4.65	4.72	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	6	26	4.81	210/1503	4.34	4.31	4.24	4.17	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	31	4.91	164/1506	4.41	4.40	4.26	4.17	4.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	0	8	24	4.75	142/1311	4.16	3.78	3.85	3.68	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	546/1490	4.15	4.26	4.05	3.85	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	3	1	19	4.70	459/1502	4.56	4.54	4.26	4.06	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	400/1489	4.44	4.43	4.29	4.07	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	20	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	3.81	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	36	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	36	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	6	0.00-0.99	2	A	23	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	18
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	37	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	11	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	28				
				?	0						

Course Section: MLL 213 0101
 Title: FILM AND SOCIETY SPAIN
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1158
 JAN 18, 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	1	4	4	7	4.06	1131/1669	4.06	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	5	4	3.56	1445/1666	3.56	4.28	4.19	4.29	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	632/1421	4.44	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	1184/1617	3.88	4.27	4.15	4.24	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	6	6	4.00	773/1555	4.00	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	478/1543	4.44	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	3	3	8	4.20	926/1647	4.20	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	2	7	1	3.38	1408/1605	3.38	4.13	4.07	4.15	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1154/1514	4.13	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	358/1551	4.93	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	987/1503	4.13	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	693/1506	4.47	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	55/1311	4.93	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	3	10	4.25	692/1490	4.25	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	3	2	9	4.06	990/1502	4.06	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.06	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	3	3	3	7	3.88	1137/1489	3.88	4.43	4.29	4.36	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	13	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 3	Under-grad 16	Non-major 14
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

Course Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1159
 JAN 18, 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	1	0	1	12	15	4.38	769/1669	4.38	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	2	18	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	20	4.48	582/1421	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	970/1617	4.11	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	1	3	8	9	3.58	1192/1555	3.58	4.17	4.00	3.96	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	7	2	8	3.79	1115/1543	3.79	4.19	4.06	4.10	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	11	13	4.21	907/1647	4.21	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	1	3	15	6	4.04	891/1605	4.09	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	7	17	4.38	984/1514	4.37	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	7	21	4.69	1000/1551	4.78	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	10	14	4.24	887/1503	4.31	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	8	19	4.55	594/1506	4.54	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	0	3	4	6	7	3.85	731/1311	4.00	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	2	6	4	3.44	1196/1490	3.44	4.26	4.05	4.11	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	1208/1502	3.75	4.54	4.26	4.31	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1023/1489	4.06	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: MAY, BRIGITTE (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1159
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	21	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title: WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1160
 JAN 18, 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	1	0	1	12	15	4.38	769/1669	4.38	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	6	2	18	4.29	841/1666	4.29	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	20	4.48	582/1421	4.48	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	9	1	0	4	5	9	4.11	970/1617	4.11	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	5	1	3	8	9	3.58	1192/1555	3.58	4.17	4.00	3.96	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	8	1	1	7	2	8	3.79	1115/1543	3.79	4.19	4.06	4.10	3.79	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	11	13	4.21	907/1647	4.21	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	28	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	11	8	4.13	820/1605	4.09	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.09	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	10	12	4.36	993/1514	4.37	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	567/1551	4.78	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	12	11	4.38	753/1503	4.31	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	7	16	4.52	623/1506	4.54	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	6	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	507/1311	4.00	3.78	3.85	3.96	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	1	2	6	4	3.44	1196/1490	3.44	4.26	4.05	4.11	3.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	1	3	3	7	3.75	1208/1502	3.75	4.54	4.26	4.31	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	1023/1489	4.06	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.06	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	3.99	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.36	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.59	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.63	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	27	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	4.20	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	5.00	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.67	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	5.00	4.34	5.00	****	

Course Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 60
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1160
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	21	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	20
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	29	Non-major	9
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	21				
				?	1						

Course Section: MLL 370 0101
 Title 19TH CENT RUSS LIT/SOC
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1161
 JAN 18, 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	1	1	5	6	4.23	938/1669	4.23	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1455/1666	3.54	4.28	4.19	4.20	3.54	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	1100/1421	3.83	4.36	4.24	4.25	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	899/1617	4.17	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	80/1555	4.92	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1130/1543	3.77	4.19	4.06	4.14	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	4	6	3.92	1137/1647	3.92	4.18	4.12	4.14	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1353/1668	4.31	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	4	5	4.00	918/1605	4.00	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	1052/1514	4.31	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	1223/1551	4.46	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	8	4.31	835/1503	4.31	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	0	0	9	4.17	980/1506	4.17	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	1	3	4	3.55	919/1311	3.55	3.78	3.85	3.97	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	778/1490	4.14	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	729/1502	4.43	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	1	5	4.29	903/1489	4.29	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	729/1006	3.60	4.14	4.00	4.10	3.60	
Self Paced															
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: MLL 406 0101
 Title INTERCULTURAL MEDIA TH
 Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1162
 JAN 18, 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	3	4.75	269/1669	4.75	4.33	4.23	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.28	4.19	4.22	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.36	4.24	4.38	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.17	4.00	4.08	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.19	4.06	4.18	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	213/1647	4.75	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.70	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.39	4.39	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	142/1311	4.75	3.78	3.85	3.88	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.26	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.43	4.29	4.52	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	4.50	4.14	4.00	4.21	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	81/ 112	4.00	4.00	4.38	4.74	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 97	4.00	3.00	4.36	4.69	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	77/ 92	3.00	3.50	4.22	4.48	3.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	72/ 105	4.00	4.00	4.20	4.27	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.86	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: MLL 430 0106
 Title INTERNSHIP:MOD LANG/LI
 Instructor: WALCOTT, YASUKO
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1163
 JAN 18, 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	2	1	4.33	816/1669	4.33	4.33	4.23	4.39	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1387/1666	3.67	4.28	4.19	4.22	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.19	4.06	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.60	4.67	4.70	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	4.13	4.07	4.16	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	34/ 58	4.33	4.33	4.22	3.94	4.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	29/ 52	4.00	4.00	4.06	3.80	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	5.00	4.39	3.78	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	19/ 40	4.00	4.00	3.97	3.81	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.50	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: MLL 603 0101
 Title POLI ECONOMY OF CULTUR
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1164
 JAN 18, 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	0	10	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	181/1666	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.19	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	557/1421	4.50	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1029/1617	4.00	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	100/1555	4.90	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.19	4.06	4.27	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	367/1647	4.60	4.18	4.12	4.15	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	335/1605	4.56	4.13	4.07	4.13	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.39	4.39	4.37	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	326/1506	4.78	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	1	1	2	2	2.89	1165/1311	2.89	3.78	3.85	3.89	2.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	214/1490	4.80	4.26	4.05	4.18	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	865/1489	4.33	4.43	4.29	4.44	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	2	2	2	2	3.50	759/1006	3.50	4.14	4.00	4.11	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	4.00	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course Section: MLL 605 0101
 Title: FIELD OF INTERCULT COM
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1165
 JAN 18, 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	3	0	0	0	4	1	9	4.36	793/1669	4.36	4.33	4.23	4.35	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	5	5	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.28	4.19	4.19	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	847/1421	4.21	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.21	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1196/1617	3.86	4.27	4.15	4.24	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	255/1555	4.62	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	608/1543	4.31	4.19	4.06	4.27	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	4	1	3	2	3	2.92	1543/1647	2.92	4.18	4.12	4.15	2.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.13	4.07	4.13	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	2	0	4	2	5	3.62	1366/1514	3.62	4.39	4.39	4.37	3.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1028/1551	4.67	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	1	3	4	3	3.38	1370/1503	3.38	4.31	4.24	4.22	3.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1239/1506	3.77	4.40	4.26	4.24	3.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	7	1	1	0	3	1	3.33	1027/1311	3.33	3.78	3.85	3.89	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1112/1490	3.62	4.26	4.05	4.18	3.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	680/1502	4.46	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.46	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	585/1489	4.62	4.43	4.29	4.44	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	4	4	3	3.67	694/1006	3.67	4.14	4.00	4.11	3.67	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.00	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	3.50	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.93	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.45	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	1	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	0	Graduate
			General	0	Under-grad
			Electives	0	11
			Other	10	Major
					Non-major
					16
					### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant