

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 190 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>The World Of Language I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Westphal,German</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>34</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	4	0	0	2	7	7	14	4.10	1058/1520	4.50	4.44	4.31	4.14	4.10
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	5	4	8	14	4.00	1086/1520	4.41	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	19	4.45	621/1291	4.64	4.56	4.33	4.24	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	19	2	1	0	6	3	3.58	1291/1483	3.97	4.45	4.23	4.09	3.58
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	4	9	17	4.32	550/1417	4.30	4.33	4.08	4.02	4.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	26	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	****/1405	4.17	4.38	4.12	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	2	1	6	1	5	16	4.00	999/1504	4.16	4.28	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	21	9	4.30	1280/1519	4.65	4.70	4.70	4.71	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	1	3	11	9	1	3.24	1374/1495	3.94	4.21	4.11	4.01	3.24
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	10	8	9	3.73	1342/1459	4.37	4.55	4.47	4.40	3.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	1	2	11	16	4.29	1322/1460	4.63	4.83	4.74	4.68	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	3	7	6	12	3.77	1236/1455	4.33	4.43	4.32	4.26	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	3	5	7	14	4.00	1094/1456	4.48	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	5	7	5	9	3.69	971/1316	4.33	4.16	4.03	3.91	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	2	1	3	2	6	3.64	998/1243	4.05	4.37	4.17	3.98	3.64
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1096/1241	4.09	4.58	4.33	4.14	3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	2	1	5	3	3	3.29	1181/1236	4.11	4.51	4.40	4.19	3.29
4. Were special techniques successful	20	11	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/889	****	4.20	4.02	3.89	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 190 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>The World Of Language I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Westphal,German</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>34</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.19	4.31	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.89	4.60	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.59	4.43	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.33	4.20	3.90	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.08	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	33	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.67	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	33	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.17	4.37	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	19	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	16						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	4	Under-grad	34	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	3	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	5						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 190 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>The World Of Language I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Field,Thomas T</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	149/1520	4.50	4.44	4.31	4.14	4.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	176/1520	4.41	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	213/1291	4.64	4.56	4.33	4.24	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	1	3	5	13	4.36	680/1483	3.97	4.45	4.23	4.09	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	9	16	4.28	596/1417	4.30	4.33	4.08	4.02	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	0	4	8	11	4.17	742/1405	4.17	4.38	4.12	3.96	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	6	16	4.31	681/1504	4.16	4.28	4.16	4.13	4.31
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1519	4.65	4.70	4.70	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	9	16	4.64	232/1495	3.94	4.21	4.11	4.01	4.64
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1459	4.37	4.55	4.47	4.40	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	218/1460	4.63	4.83	4.74	4.68	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	173/1455	4.33	4.43	4.32	4.26	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	80/1456	4.48	4.55	4.34	4.26	4.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	32/1316	4.33	4.16	4.03	3.91	4.96
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	449/1243	4.05	4.37	4.17	3.98	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	537/1241	4.09	4.58	4.33	4.14	4.53
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	150/1236	4.11	4.51	4.40	4.19	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	14	12	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/889	****	4.20	4.02	3.89	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 190 02</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>The World Of Language I</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Field,Thomas T</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>29</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.19	4.31	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.89	4.60	4.51	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.59	4.43	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.17	4.37	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.17	4.22	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	18	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	6	Under-grad	29	Non-major	20
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 213 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Film And Society Spain</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bell,Alan S</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	8	7	18	4.08	1070/1520	4.08	4.44	4.31	4.36	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	3	8	8	15	3.86	1212/1520	3.86	4.42	4.27	4.34	3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	3	1	8	9	11	3.75	1099/1291	3.75	4.56	4.33	4.44	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	2	8	15	9	3.75	1209/1483	3.75	4.45	4.23	4.28	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	7	6	6	11	5	3.03	1344/1417	3.03	4.33	4.08	4.14	3.03
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	10	12	9	3.85	1010/1405	3.85	4.38	4.12	4.13	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	3	5	8	17	4.18	825/1504	4.18	4.28	4.16	4.15	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	33	4.97	178/1519	4.97	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	1	0	15	9	2	3.41	1321/1495	3.41	4.21	4.11	4.16	3.41
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	3	0	4	8	19	4.18	1150/1459	4.18	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	2	1	31	4.85	675/1460	4.85	4.83	4.74	4.80	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	7	9	16	4.09	1037/1455	4.09	4.43	4.32	4.39	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	12	18	4.26	936/1456	4.26	4.55	4.34	4.46	4.26
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	29	4.76	138/1316	4.76	4.16	4.03	4.18	4.76
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	5	2	15	4.21	660/1243	4.21	4.37	4.17	4.22	4.21
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	3	2	6	12	4.04	906/1241	4.04	4.58	4.33	4.38	4.04
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	3	4	10	5	3.54	1130/1236	3.54	4.51	4.40	4.45	3.54
4. Were special techniques successful	12	15	2	1	4	0	2	2.89	849/889	2.89	4.20	4.02	3.99	2.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 213 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Film And Society Spain</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bell,Alan S</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	34	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	35	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.19	4.40	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	34	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/67	****	4.89	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.83	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.33	4.20	4.34	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	34	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	34	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 213 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Film And Society Spain</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bell,Alan S</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>36</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	34	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.17	4.60	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1 A 14	Required for Majors	4 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0 B 13		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4 C 5	General	16 Under-grad 36 Non-major 34
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0	Electives	12 **** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 3		

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 219 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Contemp French Cinema</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bazgan,Nicoleta</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	0	3	2	12	4.16	1016/1520	4.16	4.44	4.31	4.36	4.16
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	0	1	14	4.21	930/1520	4.21	4.42	4.27	4.34	4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	2	13	4.21	844/1291	4.21	4.56	4.33	4.44	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	3	2	10	3.79	1193/1483	3.79	4.45	4.23	4.28	3.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	10	4.00	803/1417	4.00	4.33	4.08	4.14	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	1	3	11	3.95	913/1405	3.95	4.38	4.12	4.13	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	4	1	10	3.84	1150/1504	3.84	4.28	4.16	4.15	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	1	3	9	4.27	650/1495	4.27	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.27
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	0	3	11	4.24	1108/1459	4.24	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	1	15	4.71	1001/1460	4.71	4.83	4.74	4.80	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	0	1	0	14	4.41	748/1455	4.41	4.43	4.32	4.39	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	0	14	4.41	777/1456	4.41	4.55	4.34	4.46	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	138/1316	4.76	4.16	4.03	4.18	4.76
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	200/1243	4.80	4.37	4.17	4.22	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.58	4.33	4.38	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	341/1236	4.80	4.51	4.40	4.45	4.80



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 219 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Contemp French Cinema</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Bazgan,Nicoleta</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>19</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	360/889	4.20	4.20	4.02	3.99	4.20

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0 A 13	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2 C 0	General	7 Under-grad 19 Non-major 17
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4 D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 3		

\*\*\*\* - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 230 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>World Lang Communities</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>May,Brigitte Z</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	894/1520	4.29	4.44	4.31	4.36	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	10	6	4.05	1060/1520	4.05	4.42	4.27	4.34	4.05
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	713/1291	4.38	4.56	4.33	4.44	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	4	8	6	4.11	949/1483	4.11	4.45	4.23	4.28	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	4	10	4.05	779/1417	4.05	4.33	4.08	4.14	4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	3	2	9	4	3.78	1059/1405	3.78	4.38	4.12	4.13	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	7	9	4.10	924/1504	4.10	4.28	4.16	4.15	4.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	1197/1519	4.43	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	4	13	2	3.89	1029/1495	3.89	4.21	4.11	4.16	3.89
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	4	14	1	3.84	1308/1459	3.84	4.55	4.47	4.52	3.84
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	1180/1460	4.53	4.83	4.74	4.80	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	4	10	5	4.05	1051/1455	4.05	4.43	4.32	4.39	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	888/1456	4.32	4.55	4.34	4.46	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	976/1316	3.69	4.16	4.03	4.18	3.69
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	385/1243	4.53	4.37	4.17	4.22	4.53
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	3	2	1	9	4.07	898/1241	4.07	4.58	4.33	4.38	4.07
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	623/1236	4.53	4.51	4.40	4.45	4.53
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	2	2	2	5	2	3.23	782/889	3.23	4.20	4.02	3.99	3.23

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 230 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>World Lang Communities</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>May,Brigitte Z</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>22</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/67	****	4.89	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/62	****	4.83	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/66	****	4.33	4.20	4.34	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	4.00	4.07	4.93	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	22	Non-major	11
84-150	4	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	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 240 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Cult. Sustainability</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Deverneil,Marie</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	360/1520	4.69	4.44	4.31	4.36	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	7	4.31	847/1520	4.31	4.42	4.27	4.34	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	386/1291	4.67	4.56	4.33	4.44	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	778/1483	4.27	4.45	4.23	4.28	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	406/1417	4.46	4.33	4.08	4.14	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	211/1405	4.69	4.38	4.12	4.13	4.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	770/1504	4.23	4.28	4.16	4.15	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	532/1495	4.36	4.21	4.11	4.16	4.36
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	796/1459	4.54	4.55	4.47	4.52	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	435/1460	4.92	4.83	4.74	4.80	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	512/1455	4.62	4.43	4.32	4.39	4.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	566/1456	4.62	4.55	4.34	4.46	4.62
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	64/1316	4.92	4.16	4.03	4.18	4.92
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	298/1243	4.67	4.37	4.17	4.22	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	188/1241	4.89	4.58	4.33	4.38	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	239/1236	4.89	4.51	4.40	4.45	4.89

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 240 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Cult. Sustainability</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Deverneil,Marie</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	349/889	4.22	4.20	4.02	3.99	4.22

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	4	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 280 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Span Spkng World</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Poggio,Sara Z</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	5	2	6	7	5	3.20	1484/1520	3.20	4.44	4.31	4.36	3.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	10	4	4	3.08	1459/1520	3.08	4.42	4.27	4.34	3.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	5	5	9	3.63	1151/1291	3.63	4.56	4.33	4.44	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	5	1	6	6	5	3.22	1419/1483	3.22	4.45	4.23	4.28	3.22
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	5	6	7	3.32	1257/1417	3.32	4.33	4.08	4.14	3.32
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	2	8	5	6	3.28	1283/1405	3.28	4.38	4.12	4.13	3.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	8	3	5	3	4	2.65	1469/1504	2.65	4.28	4.16	4.15	2.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	17	7	4.29	1286/1519	4.29	4.70	4.70	4.64	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	2	3	3	5	3	1	2.73	1466/1495	2.73	4.21	4.11	4.16	2.73
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	4	6	2	5	4	2.95	1442/1459	2.95	4.55	4.47	4.52	2.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	1	0	5	7	8	4.00	1394/1460	4.00	4.83	4.74	4.80	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	7	1	3	7	3	2.90	1417/1455	2.90	4.43	4.32	4.39	2.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	8	0	5	3	5	2.86	1422/1456	2.86	4.55	4.34	4.46	2.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	7	2	5	0	7	2.90	1244/1316	2.90	4.16	4.03	4.18	2.90
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	3	6	6	3	3.37	1105/1243	3.37	4.37	4.17	4.22	3.37
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	2	4	3	5	4	3.28	1175/1241	3.28	4.58	4.33	4.38	3.28
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	2	4	5	4	3.28	1182/1236	3.28	4.51	4.40	4.45	3.28
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	4	2	4	1	4	2.93	839/889	2.93	4.20	4.02	3.99	2.93

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 280 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Span Spkng World</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Poggio,Sara Z</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.57	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/165	****	5.00	4.19	4.40	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.74	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	1	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	4.59	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.89	4.60	4.33	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.55	4.34	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/62	****	4.83	4.54	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/68	****	5.00	4.59	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/66	****	4.33	4.20	4.34	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	****/32	****	****	4.36	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	****/31	****	****	4.15	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.65	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.67	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.53	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/24	****	5.00	4.17	4.60	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	2	2	0	0	2.50	****/15	****	5.00	4.17	4.87	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/22	****	4.00	4.07	4.93	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 280 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Span Spkng World</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Poggio,Sara Z</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>25</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/15	****	5.00	4.06	4.85	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.86	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	14	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 301 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Textual Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shields,Anna M.</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	176/1520	4.87	4.44	4.31	4.33	4.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	145/1520	4.87	4.42	4.27	4.26	4.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	97/1291	4.93	4.56	4.33	4.32	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	132/1483	4.87	4.45	4.23	4.25	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	3	8	4.00	803/1417	4.00	4.33	4.08	4.07	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	135/1405	4.80	4.38	4.12	4.13	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	331/1504	4.60	4.28	4.16	4.15	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	1097/1519	4.53	4.70	4.70	4.69	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	254/1495	4.62	4.21	4.11	4.07	4.62
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1459	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	15	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	205/1455	4.87	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.55	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.16	4.03	4.08	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	235/1243	4.75	4.37	4.17	4.16	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	198/1241	4.88	4.58	4.33	4.34	4.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.41	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	7	4	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	334/889	4.25	4.20	4.02	4.02	4.25

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 301 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Textual Analysis</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shields,Anna M.</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>15</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Field Work</b>														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	5
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	10
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 305 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Intercultural Comm</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCray,Stanley</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>34</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	2	4	8	18	4.12	1049/1520	4.12	4.44	4.31	4.33	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	7	22	4.48	611/1520	4.48	4.42	4.27	4.26	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	25	4.68	376/1291	4.68	4.56	4.33	4.32	4.68
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	191/1483	4.79	4.45	4.23	4.25	4.79
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	7	7	17	4.25	614/1417	4.25	4.33	4.08	4.07	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	17	0	3	2	2	10	4.12	784/1405	4.12	4.38	4.12	4.13	4.12
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	1	0	6	25	4.61	331/1504	4.61	4.28	4.16	4.15	4.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	18	14	4.39	1220/1519	4.39	4.70	4.70	4.69	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	9	16	4.52	342/1495	4.52	4.21	4.11	4.07	4.52
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	5	25	4.77	427/1459	4.77	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	2	27	4.74	923/1460	4.74	4.83	4.74	4.72	4.74
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	4	22	4.48	661/1455	4.48	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	2	5	21	4.34	855/1456	4.34	4.55	4.34	4.32	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	2	5	21	4.68	193/1316	4.68	4.16	4.03	4.08	4.68
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	2	1	3	12	4.39	530/1243	4.39	4.37	4.17	4.16	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	1	1	2	2	13	4.32	727/1241	4.32	4.58	4.33	4.34	4.32
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	2	15	4.55	606/1236	4.55	4.51	4.40	4.41	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	14	9	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	372/889	4.18	4.20	4.02	4.02	4.18

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 305 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Intercultural Comm</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCray,Stanley</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>34</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	1	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/164	****	****	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	31	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.19	4.15	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	31	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/160	****	****	4.45	4.47	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	31	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/158	****	****	4.36	4.31	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	31	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/150	****	****	4.05	3.98	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/67	****	4.89	4.60	4.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	32	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.55	4.35	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	2	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/62	****	4.83	4.54	4.55	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.59	4.63	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	31	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.33	4.20	4.14	****
<b>Field Work</b>														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	31	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/32	****	****	4.36	3.94	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/31	****	****	4.15	3.82	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/23	****	****	4.48	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/27	****	****	4.23	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/20	****	****	4.23	4.50	****
<b>Self Paced</b>														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/24	****	5.00	4.17	3.90	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	32	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	32	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/22	****	4.00	4.07	3.91	****

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 305 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro Intercultural Comm</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>McCray,Stanley</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>34</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	32	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/15	****	5.00	4.06	4.40	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	31	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/12	****	****	4.16	4.70	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	21	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	6	Under-grad	34	Non-major	33
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	8	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	10						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 311 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Korean Culture</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yoon,Kyung-Eun</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	323/1520	4.72	4.44	4.31	4.33	4.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	513/1520	4.56	4.42	4.27	4.26	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	11	4.39	713/1291	4.39	4.56	4.33	4.32	4.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	2	12	4.39	658/1483	4.39	4.45	4.23	4.25	4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	4	11	4.47	395/1417	4.47	4.33	4.08	4.07	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	0	3	10	4.25	656/1405	4.25	4.38	4.12	4.13	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	291/1504	4.65	4.28	4.16	4.15	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	470/1495	4.42	4.21	4.11	4.07	4.42
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	234/1459	4.88	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	596/1460	4.88	4.83	4.74	4.72	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	401/1455	4.71	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	528/1456	4.65	4.55	4.34	4.32	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	233/1316	4.60	4.16	4.03	4.08	4.60
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	732/1243	4.11	4.37	4.17	4.16	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	874/1241	4.11	4.58	4.33	4.34	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	606/1236	4.56	4.51	4.40	4.41	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	10	2	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	583/889	3.83	4.20	4.02	4.02	3.83

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 311 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intro to Korean Culture</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Yoon,Kyung-Eun</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>18</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Self Paced</b>														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/15	****	5.00	4.17	4.60	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/22	****	4.00	4.07	3.91	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	4	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	7						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 328 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Chinese Fiction &amp; Drama</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,William I</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	399/1520	4.67	4.44	4.31	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	809/1520	4.33	4.42	4.27	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	591/1291	4.48	4.56	4.33	4.32	4.48
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	691/1483	4.35	4.45	4.23	4.25	4.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	273/1417	4.62	4.33	4.08	4.07	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	3	13	4.40	506/1405	4.40	4.38	4.12	4.13	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	7	13	4.52	415/1504	4.52	4.28	4.16	4.15	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	4	4.19	1354/1519	4.19	4.70	4.70	4.69	4.19
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	390/1495	4.47	4.21	4.11	4.07	4.47
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	463/1459	4.75	4.55	4.47	4.47	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	272/1460	4.95	4.83	4.74	4.72	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	581/1455	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	453/1456	4.70	4.55	4.34	4.32	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	427/1316	4.38	4.16	4.03	4.08	4.38
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	235/1243	4.75	4.37	4.17	4.16	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	455/1241	4.63	4.58	4.33	4.34	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	544/1236	4.63	4.51	4.40	4.41	4.63



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 328 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Chinese Fiction &amp; Drama</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Brown,William I</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>21</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	456/889	4.00	4.20	4.02	4.02	4.00

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	20	Non-major	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	5	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	6						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 406 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intercultural Media Thry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shewbridge,Will</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	167/1520	4.88	4.44	4.31	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	584/1520	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1291	****	4.56	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	493/1483	4.50	4.45	4.23	4.33	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	156/1417	4.75	4.33	4.08	4.12	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	103/1405	4.88	4.38	4.12	4.25	4.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	190/1504	4.75	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	262/1495	4.60	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.60
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	748/1459	4.57	4.55	4.47	4.54	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	903/1460	4.75	4.83	4.74	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	387/1455	4.71	4.43	4.32	4.37	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.55	4.34	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.16	4.03	4.12	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	405/1243	4.50	4.37	4.17	4.42	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	564/1241	4.50	4.58	4.33	4.56	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1236	4.67	4.51	4.40	4.64	4.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 406 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Intercultural Media Thry</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Shewbridge,Will</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>10</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/889	****	4.20	4.02	4.26	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 430 23</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Internship:Mod Lang/Ling</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhdanovych,Vira</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>1</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.45	4.23	4.33	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.21	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.55	4.47	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1455	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.55	4.34	4.41	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.42	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.58	4.33	4.56	5.00

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 430 23</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Internship:Mod Lang/Ling</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Zhdanovych,Vira</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>1</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Discussion</b>														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.64	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	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 498H 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Honors Seminar</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Field,Thomas T</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	479/1520	4.60	4.44	4.31	4.44	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	443/1520	4.60	4.42	4.27	4.32	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.45	4.23	4.33	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	119/1417	4.80	4.33	4.08	4.12	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	135/1405	4.80	4.38	4.12	4.25	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1504	****	4.28	4.16	4.21	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	130/1495	4.80	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.80
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.55	4.47	4.54	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1455	5.00	4.43	4.32	4.37	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.55	4.34	4.41	5.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.42	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.58	4.33	4.56	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.64	5.00
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	42/67	4.67	4.89	4.60	4.59	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/66	5.00	5.00	4.55	4.60	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	34/62	4.67	4.83	4.54	4.60	4.67

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 498H 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Honors Seminar</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Field,Thomas T</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/68	5.00	5.00	4.59	4.56	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/66	****	4.33	4.20	4.19	****

### Frequency Distribution

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

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 603 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Poli Economy Of Culture</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sinnigen,John H</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	276/1520	4.77	4.44	4.31	4.39	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	809/1520	4.33	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	432/1291	4.62	4.56	4.33	4.38	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	747/1483	4.31	4.45	4.23	4.25	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	273/1417	4.62	4.33	4.08	4.13	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	303/1405	4.58	4.38	4.12	4.24	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	2	1	7	3.85	1150/1504	3.85	4.28	4.16	4.21	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	759/1495	4.17	4.21	4.11	4.20	4.17
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	0	11	4.62	696/1459	4.62	4.55	4.47	4.48	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	1	9	4.46	686/1455	4.46	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.46
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	725/1456	4.46	4.55	4.34	4.32	4.46
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	1	1	1	2	3.00	1210/1316	3.00	4.16	4.03	3.86	3.00
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	128/1243	4.90	4.37	4.17	4.23	4.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	564/1241	4.50	4.58	4.33	4.39	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	341/1236	4.80	4.51	4.40	4.47	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	2	1	0	0	4	3.43	732/889	3.43	4.20	4.02	4.06	3.43



## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 603 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Poli Economy Of Culture</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Sinnigen,John H</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>14</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.89	4.60	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/66	****	5.00	4.55	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/62	****	4.83	4.54	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/66	****	4.33	4.20	4.26	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 605 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Field Of Intercult Comm</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Larkey,Edward</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	465/1520	4.62	4.44	4.31	4.39	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	847/1520	4.31	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.31
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	414/1291	4.64	4.56	4.33	4.38	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	550/1483	4.46	4.45	4.23	4.25	4.46
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	632/1417	4.23	4.33	4.08	4.13	4.23
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	493/1405	4.42	4.38	4.12	4.24	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	0	3	7	4.00	999/1504	4.00	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	738/1495	4.18	4.21	4.11	4.20	4.18
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	1108/1459	4.23	4.55	4.47	4.48	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	701/1460	4.85	4.83	4.74	4.77	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1075/1455	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	900/1456	4.31	4.55	4.34	4.32	4.31
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	1	1	3	5	3.67	987/1316	3.67	4.16	4.03	3.86	3.67
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	9	4.46	449/1243	4.46	4.37	4.17	4.23	4.46
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	385/1241	4.69	4.58	4.33	4.39	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	1	0	10	4.38	741/1236	4.38	4.51	4.40	4.47	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	0	6	2	0	2	0	3	3.29	770/889	3.29	4.20	4.02	4.06	3.29

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 605 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Field Of Intercult Comm</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Larkey,Edward</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>13</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Laboratory</b>														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/165	****	5.00	4.19	3.75	****
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/67	****	4.89	4.60	4.62	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	5.00	4.55	4.62	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/62	****	4.83	4.54	4.59	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.33	4.20	4.26	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	4						

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 626 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Methods Intercult Tr</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Medina,Adriana</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>General</b>														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.44	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	192/1520	4.80	4.42	4.27	4.28	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1291	5.00	4.56	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.45	4.23	4.25	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1417	5.00	4.33	4.08	4.13	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	135/1405	4.80	4.38	4.12	4.24	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	148/1504	4.80	4.28	4.16	4.21	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1519	5.00	4.70	4.70	4.77	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1495	5.00	4.21	4.11	4.20	5.00
<b>Lecture</b>														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	374/1459	4.80	4.55	4.47	4.48	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1460	5.00	4.83	4.74	4.77	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	268/1455	4.80	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1456	5.00	4.55	4.34	4.32	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	927/1316	3.75	4.16	4.03	3.86	3.75
<b>Discussion</b>														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1243	5.00	4.37	4.17	4.23	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.58	4.33	4.39	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1236	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.47	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	91/889	4.80	4.20	4.02	4.06	4.80

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaires

<b>Course-Section:</b>	<b>MLL 626 01</b>
<b>Title:</b>	<b>Adv Methods Intercult Tr</b>
<b>Instructor:</b>	<b>Medina,Adriana</b>

**Term - Fall 2011**

<b>Enrollment:</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Questionnaires:</b>	<b>5</b>

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Org	UMBC	Level	Sect
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
<b>Seminar</b>														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/67	****	4.89	4.60	4.62	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/68	****	5.00	4.59	4.62	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/66	****	4.33	4.20	4.26	****

### Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	5	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	0	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	**** - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						