

Course-Section: MLL 190 0101
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 62
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1105
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	5	10	16	4.06	1083/1556	4.06	4.36	4.25	4.06	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	4	7	11	11	3.71	1308/1557	3.71	4.24	4.21	4.13	3.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	3	11	5	14	3.74	1101/1335	3.74	4.40	4.24	4.13	3.74
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	3	4	2	9	13	3.81	1179/1510	3.81	4.24	4.19	4.07	3.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	3	10	17	4.12	662/1479	4.12	4.24	3.97	3.90	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	4	5	4	9	9	3.45	1223/1424	3.45	4.07	4.08	3.91	3.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	7	22	4.52	464/1537	4.52	4.28	4.15	4.12	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	23	10	4.30	1279/1553	4.30	4.78	4.69	4.66	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	2	3	12	8	3	3.25	1396/1536	3.25	4.04	4.07	3.91	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	4	2	10	14	3.94	1271/1487	3.94	4.43	4.44	4.37	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	3	6	9	14	4.06	1390/1491	4.06	4.76	4.70	4.61	4.06
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	7	9	11	3.75	1243/1489	3.75	4.24	4.27	4.18	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	7	2	8	12	3.68	1258/1481	3.68	4.35	4.28	4.18	3.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	2	3	10	3	9	3.52	934/1246	3.52	4.00	3.93	3.78	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	5	3	6	2	4	2.85	1315/1411	2.85	4.28	4.00	3.78	2.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	4	3	6	1	6	3.10	1308/1413	3.10	4.44	4.23	3.96	3.10
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	5	3	5	2	5	2.95	1337/1408	2.95	4.58	4.27	4.03	2.95
4. Were special techniques successful	15	16	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 856	****	4.01	4.00	3.87	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	2	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	15						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	35	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	19				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 203 0101
 Title INTERCULTURAL COMM
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1106
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
			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	3	5	1	2	2	2.62	1542/1556	2.62	4.36	4.25	4.33	2.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	3	2	1	2.54	1536/1557	2.54	4.24	4.21	4.30	2.54
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	1	1	1	5	3.00	1263/1335	3.00	4.40	4.24	4.37	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	2	2	2	3	2.85	1486/1510	2.85	4.24	4.19	4.23	2.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	3	1	3	2	2.69	1423/1479	2.69	4.24	3.97	3.88	2.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	5	3	0	2	2	2.42	1413/1424	2.42	4.07	4.08	4.04	2.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	6	0	2	3	2	2.62	1506/1537	2.62	4.28	4.15	4.17	2.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1319/1553	4.23	4.78	4.69	4.69	4.23
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	3	2	1	1	2.27	1515/1536	2.27	4.04	4.07	4.13	2.27
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	3	2	1	3	2.83	1464/1487	2.83	4.43	4.44	4.47	2.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	1	2	2	6	3.69	1452/1491	3.69	4.76	4.70	4.75	3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	3	0	1	1	1.83	1485/1489	1.83	4.24	4.27	4.32	1.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	7	0	1	1	2	2.18	1470/1481	2.18	4.35	4.28	4.37	2.18
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	4	2	3	3.45	968/1246	3.45	4.00	3.93	4.02	3.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	2	3	0	2	2.60	1351/1411	2.60	4.28	4.00	4.05	2.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	2	6	4.20	848/1413	4.20	4.44	4.23	4.28	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	3	0	5	3.70	1150/1408	3.70	4.58	4.27	4.31	3.70
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	3	1	1	1	3	3.00	768/ 856	3.00	4.01	4.00	3.92	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 205 0101
 Title GREAT BOOKS: FRENCH
 Instructor: STERN, GALA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1107
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	352/1556	4.67	4.36	4.25	4.33	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	603/1557	4.44	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	349/1335	4.63	4.40	4.24	4.37	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	715/1510	4.29	4.24	4.19	4.23	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	144/1479	4.78	4.24	3.97	3.88	4.78
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	145/1424	4.75	4.07	4.08	4.04	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	107/1537	4.88	4.28	4.15	4.17	4.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	712/1553	4.89	4.78	4.69	4.69	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	623/1536	4.29	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	595/1487	4.67	4.43	4.44	4.47	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	389/1489	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1481	4.89	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1246	****	4.00	3.93	4.02	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	164/1411	4.83	4.28	4.00	4.05	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	244/1413	4.86	4.44	4.23	4.28	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	267/1408	4.86	4.58	4.27	4.31	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 856	****	4.01	4.00	3.92	****

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	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 213 0101
 Title FLIM AND SOCIETY SPAIN
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1108
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	404/1556	4.62	4.36	4.25	4.33	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	686/1557	4.38	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	438/1335	4.55	4.40	4.24	4.37	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	137/1510	4.85	4.24	4.19	4.23	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	6	4.08	685/1479	4.08	4.24	3.97	3.88	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	320/1424	4.50	4.07	4.08	4.04	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	324/1537	4.64	4.28	4.15	4.17	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	868/1536	4.00	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	781/1487	4.54	4.43	4.44	4.47	4.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	558/1489	4.54	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	303/1481	4.77	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.77
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	129/1246	4.77	4.00	3.93	4.02	4.77
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	299/1411	4.60	4.28	4.00	4.05	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	574/1413	4.50	4.44	4.23	4.28	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.31	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 856	****	4.01	4.00	3.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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						

Course-Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1109
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	289/1556	4.73	4.36	4.25	4.33	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	150/1557	4.85	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	129/1335	4.91	4.40	4.24	4.37	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	5	7	17	4.41	560/1510	4.41	4.24	4.19	4.23	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	20	4.44	364/1479	4.44	4.24	3.97	3.88	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	6	7	14	4.07	765/1424	4.07	4.07	4.08	4.04	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	233/1537	4.71	4.28	4.15	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	11	16	4.59	278/1536	4.56	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	26	4.84	286/1487	4.79	4.43	4.44	4.47	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	28	4.90	513/1491	4.91	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	24	4.77	258/1489	4.73	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.81	255/1481	4.79	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	4	4	19	4.56	222/1246	4.53	4.00	3.93	4.02	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	305/1411	4.59	4.28	4.00	4.05	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	280/1413	4.81	4.44	4.23	4.28	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	173/1408	4.93	4.58	4.27	4.31	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	2	3	5	14	4.16	372/ 856	4.16	4.01	4.00	3.92	4.16
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	3.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	25	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 230 0101
 Title WORLD LANG COMMUNITIES
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1110
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	26	4.73	289/1556	4.73	4.36	4.25	4.33	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	29	4.85	150/1557	4.85	4.24	4.21	4.30	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	30	4.91	129/1335	4.91	4.40	4.24	4.37	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	5	7	17	4.41	560/1510	4.41	4.24	4.19	4.23	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	20	4.44	364/1479	4.44	4.24	3.97	3.88	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	2	0	6	7	14	4.07	765/1424	4.07	4.07	4.08	4.04	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	2	5	24	4.71	233/1537	4.71	4.28	4.15	4.17	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	32	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	1	9	13	4.52	341/1536	4.56	4.04	4.07	4.13	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	10	0	0	0	0	6	17	4.74	467/1487	4.79	4.43	4.44	4.47	4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	10	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	461/1491	4.91	4.76	4.70	4.75	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	10	0	0	0	0	7	16	4.70	350/1489	4.73	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	279/1481	4.79	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	3	0	0	3	4	13	4.50	249/1246	4.53	4.00	3.93	4.02	4.53
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	5	19	4.59	305/1411	4.59	4.28	4.00	4.05	4.59
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	5	22	4.81	280/1413	4.81	4.44	4.23	4.28	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	25	4.93	173/1408	4.93	4.58	4.27	4.31	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	2	3	5	14	4.16	372/ 856	4.16	4.01	4.00	3.92	4.16
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	32	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.96	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	32	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	3.19	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	25	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	33	Non-major	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	25				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 235 0101
 Title CULT/VALUES THRU ART I
 Instructor: BAKER, ELIZABET
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1111
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	2	13	4.37	759/1556	4.37	4.36	4.25	4.33	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	4	8	3.89	1205/1557	3.89	4.24	4.21	4.30	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	769/1335	4.27	4.40	4.24	4.37	4.27
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	10	4.37	623/1510	4.37	4.24	4.19	4.23	4.37
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	7	3	4	3.41	1215/1479	3.41	4.24	3.97	3.88	3.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	806/1424	4.00	4.07	4.08	4.04	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	3	5	6	3.61	1281/1537	3.61	4.28	4.15	4.17	3.61
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	408/1553	4.94	4.78	4.69	4.69	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	2	1	1	5	8	3.94	961/1536	3.94	4.04	4.07	4.13	3.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	1076/1487	4.28	4.43	4.44	4.47	4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.00	1090/1489	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.32	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	5	9	4.00	1070/1481	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	3	1	4	4	5	3.41	992/1246	3.41	4.00	3.93	4.02	3.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	12	4.47	398/1411	4.47	4.28	4.00	4.05	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	0	15	4.71	417/1413	4.71	4.44	4.23	4.28	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	298/1408	4.82	4.58	4.27	4.31	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	3	0	2	11	4.31	311/ 856	4.31	4.01	4.00	3.92	4.31
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	4.32	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 238	****	****	4.26	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.08	4.45	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 102	****	5.00	4.50	3.88	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.39	3.00	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	****	4.36	3.60	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	4.49	4.29	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 101	****	4.60	4.03	4.14	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	3.31	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	3.96	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	3.97	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	3.69	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	3.93	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	3.19	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.01	4.07	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.18	3.92	****

Course-Section: MLL 235 0101
 Title CULT/VALUES THRU ART I
 Instructor: BAKER, ELIZABET
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1111
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	5	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MLL 332 0101
 Title TOPICS IN GERMAN CULTU
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1112
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	802/1556	4.33	4.36	4.25	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	940/1557	4.17	4.24	4.21	4.21	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	866/1335	4.17	4.40	4.24	4.21	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1157/1510	3.83	4.24	4.19	4.20	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	610/1479	4.17	4.24	3.97	3.95	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	684/1424	4.17	4.07	4.08	4.08	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	874/1537	4.17	4.28	4.15	4.13	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	1253/1553	4.33	4.78	4.69	4.67	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	486/1536	4.40	4.04	4.07	4.07	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1024/1487	4.33	4.43	4.44	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.69	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1090/1489	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	841/1481	4.33	4.35	4.28	4.25	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1246	****	4.00	3.93	3.98	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	739/1411	4.00	4.28	4.00	3.98	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1188/1413	3.50	4.44	4.23	4.23	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	763/1408	4.33	4.58	4.27	4.28	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 856	****	4.01	4.00	3.99	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 601 0101
 Title INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATI
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1113
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	22	4.91	129/1556	4.91	4.36	4.25	4.36	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	380/1557	4.61	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	369/1335	4.61	4.40	4.24	4.31	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	17	4.61	340/1510	4.61	4.24	4.19	4.27	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	18	4.77	144/1479	4.77	4.24	3.97	4.23	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	5	14	4.57	271/1424	4.57	4.07	4.08	4.34	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	17	4.73	215/1537	4.73	4.28	4.15	4.17	4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1553	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.78	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	435/1536	4.44	4.04	4.07	4.17	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	301/1487	4.83	4.43	4.44	4.43	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1491	5.00	4.76	4.70	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	519/1489	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	20	4.78	279/1481	4.78	4.35	4.28	4.28	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	2	0	3	4	10	4.05	582/1246	4.05	4.00	3.93	3.95	4.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	169/1411	4.83	4.28	4.00	4.29	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	315/1413	4.78	4.44	4.23	4.52	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	298/1408	4.83	4.58	4.27	4.55	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	247/ 856	4.44	4.01	4.00	4.16	4.44
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	****	4.07	4.59	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 258	****	****	4.10	4.63	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.36	4.67	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 238	****	****	4.26	4.59	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 214	****	****	4.08	4.63	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 102	****	5.00	4.50	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	5.00	4.39	4.65	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 90	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 98	****	5.00	4.49	4.59	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 101	****	4.60	4.03	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 61	****	****	3.92	4.30	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 60	****	****	3.86	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.31	4.18	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.09	4.35	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.09	4.58	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	****	3.84	4.18	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	30	****	****	4.01	3.97	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	32	****	****	4.18	4.10	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	4.30	****

Course-Section: MLL 601 0101
 Title INTERCULTURAL PRAGMATI
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1113
 JAN 19, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	3	A	16	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	16	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	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	16	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	2						

Course-Section: MLL 602 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC
 Instructor: KA, OMAR (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1114
 JAN 19, 2005
 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		

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	586/1556	4.47	4.36	4.25	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	407/1557	4.59	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	177/1335	4.80	4.40	4.24	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	356/1510	4.59	4.24	4.19	4.27	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	100/1479	4.88	4.24	3.97	4.23	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	444/1424	4.41	4.07	4.08	4.34	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	779/1537	4.25	4.28	4.15	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	476/1553	4.93	4.78	4.69	4.78	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	508/1536	4.35	4.04	4.07	4.17	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	301/1487	4.88	4.43	4.44	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	563/1491	4.88	4.76	4.70	4.78	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	165/1489	4.91	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	303/1481	4.82	4.35	4.28	4.28	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	4	1	6	4.18	504/1246	3.86	4.00	3.93	3.95	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	137/1411	4.88	4.28	4.00	4.29	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	340/1413	4.76	4.44	4.23	4.52	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	414/ 856	4.00	4.01	4.00	4.16	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 102	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.65	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 90	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	34/ 101	4.60	4.60	4.03	4.04	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	4	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	15	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MLL 602 0101
 Title ETHNOGRAPHY OF COMMUNC
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2004

Page 1115
 JAN 19, 2005
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	586/1556	4.47	4.36	4.25	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	407/1557	4.59	4.24	4.21	4.23	4.59
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	177/1335	4.80	4.40	4.24	4.31	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	356/1510	4.59	4.24	4.19	4.27	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	100/1479	4.88	4.24	3.97	4.23	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	444/1424	4.41	4.07	4.08	4.34	4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	779/1537	4.25	4.28	4.15	4.17	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	476/1553	4.93	4.78	4.69	4.78	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	600/1536	4.35	4.04	4.07	4.17	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	109/1487	4.88	4.43	4.44	4.43	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	588/1491	4.88	4.76	4.70	4.78	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	106/1489	4.91	4.24	4.27	4.34	4.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	189/1481	4.82	4.35	4.28	4.28	4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	919/1246	3.86	4.00	3.93	3.95	3.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	137/1411	4.88	4.28	4.00	4.29	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	340/1413	4.76	4.44	4.23	4.52	4.76
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1408	5.00	4.58	4.27	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	414/ 856	4.00	4.01	4.00	4.16	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 102	5.00	5.00	4.50	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 101	5.00	5.00	4.39	4.65	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 90	****	****	4.36	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.59	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	34/ 101	4.60	4.60	4.03	4.04	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	4	A	12	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	15	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	2	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	15	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	16				
				?	1						