

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	10	30	4.53	507/1470	4.53	4.27	4.29	4.13	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	34	4.67	288/1470	4.67	4.16	4.23	4.17	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	38	4.81	144/1252	4.81	4.44	4.27	4.21	4.81	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	22	0	1	1	1	17	4.70	228/1413	4.70	4.25	4.24	4.12	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	1	6	8	23	4.15	643/1391	4.15	4.06	4.02	3.96	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	27	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	225/1347	4.63	4.22	4.10	4.01	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	4	36	4.85	103/1455	4.85	4.35	4.16	4.16	4.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	19	22	4.54	1051/1469	4.54	4.86	4.70	4.65	4.54	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	7	27	4.74	148/1451	4.74	4.10	4.08	3.99	4.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	0	5	33	4.79	333/1407	4.79	4.49	4.43	4.40	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	36	4.92	369/1404	4.92	4.79	4.70	4.62	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	4	33	4.79	207/1401	4.79	4.38	4.28	4.22	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	1	0	0	2	3	33	4.82	217/1398	4.82	4.34	4.27	4.21	4.82	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	8	1	1	2	5	21	4.47	289/1176	4.47	4.58	3.96	3.84	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	5	6	16	4.41	429/1276	4.41	4.19	4.06	3.81	4.41	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	2	3	3	19	4.44	647/1277	4.44	4.38	4.30	4.02	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	2	0	3	22	4.67	430/1271	4.67	4.59	4.28	4.02	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	17	9	5	0	1	1	10	3.65	585/ 763	3.65	3.89	4.06	3.92	3.65	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	41	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.02	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	41	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.12	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	41	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.40	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.70	4.88	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.66	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 74	****	****	4.50	4.56	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	41	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 71	****	****	4.16	4.29	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 38	Required for Majors	23
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 6	C 0	General	7
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 11	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	8

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 218 0101
 Title FILM & SOC IN LATIN AM
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1043
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	1009/1470	4.12	4.27	4.29	4.28	4.12	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	6	3	3.47	1333/1470	3.47	4.16	4.23	4.22	3.47	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	2	0	5	9	4.31	687/1413	4.31	4.25	4.24	4.24	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	12	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1075/1391	3.60	4.06	4.02	3.97	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	8	8	4.35	467/1347	4.35	4.22	4.10	4.01	4.35	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	0	2	6	7	4.13	884/1455	4.13	4.35	4.16	4.20	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	977/1469	4.65	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	7	5	1	3.54	1203/1451	3.54	4.10	4.08	4.04	3.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1296/1407	3.64	4.49	4.43	4.41	3.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	989/1404	4.63	4.79	4.70	4.71	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	5	5	6	4.06	996/1401	4.06	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	1	2	4	5	3.64	1202/1398	3.64	4.34	4.27	4.26	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	80/1176	4.87	4.58	3.96	3.99	4.87	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	710/1276	4.00	4.19	4.06	4.01	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	589/1277	4.50	4.38	4.30	4.25	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	304/1271	4.79	4.59	4.28	4.25	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	11	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 763	****	3.89	4.06	3.98	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.42	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.34	4.50	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.72	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	18	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 222 0101
 Title CLASSICS OF JAPANESE C
 Instructor: STAFF
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1044
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	8	8	3.91	1168/1470	3.91	4.27	4.29	4.28	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	5	1	6	9	3.65	1252/1470	3.65	4.16	4.23	4.22	3.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	7	2	4	6	3.14	1207/1252	3.14	4.44	4.27	4.28	3.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	4	7	3	8	3.68	1241/1413	3.68	4.25	4.24	4.24	3.68	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	4	3	7	7	3.68	1019/1391	3.68	4.06	4.02	3.97	3.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	1	5	6	8	3.65	1100/1347	3.65	4.22	4.10	4.01	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	2	4	6	9	3.78	1153/1455	3.78	4.35	4.16	4.20	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	0	21	4.91	653/1469	4.91	4.86	4.70	4.73	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	2	5	7	4	3.72	1112/1451	3.72	4.10	4.08	4.04	3.72	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	6	6	10	4.09	1133/1407	4.09	4.49	4.43	4.41	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	1016/1404	4.61	4.79	4.70	4.71	4.61	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	6	4	11	4.04	1004/1401	4.04	4.38	4.28	4.26	4.04	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	8	9	3.91	1090/1398	3.91	4.34	4.27	4.26	3.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	2	18	4.73	134/1176	4.73	4.58	3.96	3.99	4.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	3	4	9	3.80	875/1276	3.80	4.19	4.06	4.01	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	2	6	10	4.15	848/1277	4.15	4.38	4.30	4.25	4.15	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	7	11	4.45	623/1271	4.45	4.59	4.28	4.25	4.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	13	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	421/ 763	4.00	3.89	4.06	3.98	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 1	A 11	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 9	Under-grad 23 Non-major 6
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 8	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 2		

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1045
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	5	7	19	4.06	1049/1470	4.06	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	3	6	21	4.17	895/1470	4.17	4.16	4.23	4.22	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	3	5	22	4.52	462/1252	4.52	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	3	7	20	4.17	859/1413	4.17	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	8	17	4.06	711/1391	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	4	9	18	4.17	646/1347	4.17	4.22	4.10	4.11	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	4	2	3	23	4.21	803/1455	4.21	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	196/1469	4.97	4.86	4.70	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	8	12	15	4.20	690/1451	4.19	4.10	4.08	4.07	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	6	25	4.70	516/1407	4.80	4.49	4.43	4.41	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	2	28	4.76	788/1404	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.69	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	3	8	20	4.39	710/1401	4.38	4.38	4.28	4.27	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	3	3	3	22	4.21	877/1398	4.35	4.34	4.27	4.25	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	8	24	4.65	175/1176	4.70	4.58	3.96	3.97	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	688/1276	4.09	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	0	3	4	13	4.18	827/1277	4.18	4.38	4.30	4.34	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	596/1271	4.48	4.59	4.28	4.33	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	1	1	7	8	5	3.68	570/ 763	3.68	3.89	4.06	4.07	3.68	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 36 Non-major 3
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 31	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 51
 Questionnaires: 36

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1046
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	3	5	7	19	4.06	1049/1470	4.06	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	3	3	6	21	4.17	895/1470	4.17	4.16	4.23	4.22	4.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	4	1	0	3	5	22	4.52	462/1252	4.52	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.52	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	4	3	7	20	4.17	859/1413	4.17	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	8	8	17	4.06	711/1391	4.06	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	4	9	18	4.17	646/1347	4.17	4.22	4.10	4.11	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	4	2	3	23	4.21	803/1455	4.21	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.21	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	35	4.97	196/1469	4.97	4.86	4.70	4.67	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	13	10	4.18	712/1451	4.19	4.10	4.08	4.07	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	14	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	199/1407	4.80	4.49	4.43	4.41	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	13	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	646/1404	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.69	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	14	0	1	1	1	5	14	4.36	745/1401	4.38	4.38	4.28	4.27	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	2	1	18	4.48	624/1398	4.35	4.34	4.27	4.25	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	119/1176	4.70	4.58	3.96	3.97	4.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	1	6	2	13	4.09	688/1276	4.09	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	2	0	3	4	13	4.18	827/1277	4.18	4.38	4.30	4.34	4.18	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	596/1271	4.48	4.59	4.28	4.33	4.48	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	1	1	7	8	5	3.68	570/ 763	3.68	3.89	4.06	4.07	3.68	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 15	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	9	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 36 Non-major 3
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 7	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 12	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 31	
			? 1		

Course-Section: MLL 305 0101
 Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 56
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1047
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	6	22	4.69	334/1470	4.69	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	23	4.79	153/1470	4.79	4.16	4.23	4.22	4.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1252	5.00	4.44	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	423/1413	4.50	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	19	4.52	273/1391	4.52	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.52	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	20	1	0	2	0	6	4.11	715/1347	4.11	4.22	4.10	4.11	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	25	4.83	119/1455	4.83	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	725/1469	4.86	4.86	4.70	4.67	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	211/1451	4.67	4.10	4.08	4.07	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	5	23	4.76	409/1407	4.76	4.49	4.43	4.41	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	28	4.97	185/1404	4.97	4.79	4.70	4.69	4.97	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	4.86	148/1401	4.86	4.38	4.28	4.27	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	147/1398	4.90	4.34	4.27	4.25	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	170/1176	4.65	4.58	3.96	3.97	4.65	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	290/1276	4.61	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	0	1	2	18	4.64	479/1277	4.64	4.38	4.30	4.34	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	235/1271	4.87	4.59	4.28	4.33	4.87	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	14	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	124/ 763	4.67	3.89	4.06	4.07	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 25	Required for Majors	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General	7
84-150	12	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 29
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 11	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	10
			? 0		

Course-Section: MLL 320 0101
 Title INTRNATL WOMEN DIRECTO
 Instructor: MENNEL, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1048
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	3	0	1	0	1	6	12	4.40	680/1470	4.40	4.27	4.29	4.31	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	4	4	13	4.27	786/1470	4.27	4.16	4.23	4.22	4.27	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	14	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.27	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	792/1413	4.24	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.24	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	5	15	4.50	279/1391	4.50	4.06	4.02	4.00	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	8	11	4.27	543/1347	4.27	4.22	4.10	4.11	4.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	3	14	4.36	620/1455	4.36	4.35	4.16	4.12	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	21	4.95	327/1469	4.95	4.86	4.70	4.67	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	3	14	3	4.00	845/1451	4.00	4.10	4.08	4.07	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	446/1407	4.74	4.49	4.43	4.41	4.74	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	277/1404	4.95	4.79	4.70	4.69	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	345/1401	4.70	4.38	4.28	4.27	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	426/1398	4.67	4.34	4.27	4.25	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1176	5.00	4.58	3.96	3.97	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	6	11	4.30	529/1276	4.30	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	16	4.70	416/1277	4.70	4.38	4.30	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	283/1271	4.80	4.59	4.28	4.33	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	3	0	3	6	4	3.50	613/ 763	3.50	3.89	4.06	4.07	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 236	****	****	4.22	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 248	****	****	4.23	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.33	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.28	4.27	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.59	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	****	4.70	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.66	4.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 74	****	****	4.50	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 71	****	****	4.16	4.34	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.34	4.63	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.17	4.14	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.48	4.56	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.18	4.30	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.34	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	****	4.42	4.58	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 34	****	****	4.48	4.59	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.62	4.53	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.71	4.57	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.66	4.67	****	

Course-Section: MLL 320 0101
 Title INTRNATL WOMEN DIRECTO
 Instructor: MENNEL, BARBARA
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1048
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	12	Under-grad	23	Non-major	12
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MLL 470 0101
 Title L2 ACQUISITION/LEARNIN
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 1049
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	719/1470	4.38	4.27	4.29	4.36	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	990/1470	4.06	4.16	4.23	4.25	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	12	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.44	4.27	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	9	6	4.25	766/1413	4.25	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	6	6	3.94	824/1391	3.94	4.06	4.02	4.04	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	388/1347	4.44	4.22	4.10	4.15	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	3	11	4.44	534/1455	4.44	4.35	4.16	4.15	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.86	4.70	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	4	3	3.75	1090/1451	3.75	4.10	4.08	4.17	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	970/1407	4.31	4.49	4.43	4.47	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	909/1404	4.69	4.79	4.70	4.75	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	2	9	3	3.81	1157/1401	3.81	4.38	4.28	4.32	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	993/1398	4.06	4.34	4.27	4.33	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	2	1	6	4	3.53	896/1176	3.53	4.58	3.96	4.05	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	7	4.23	589/1276	4.23	4.19	4.06	4.19	4.23	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	797/1277	4.23	4.38	4.30	4.46	4.23	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	775/1271	4.23	4.59	4.28	4.41	4.23	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	1	0	0	7	4	4.08	402/ 763	4.08	3.89	4.06	4.22	4.08	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	13
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	11	3.50-4.00	8	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
				Required for Majors	0
				General	3
				Electives	0
				Other	12
				Graduate	11
				Non-major	3
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	