

Course-Section: WMST 100 0101  
 Title INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES  
 Instructor: KUSHNER, MIKHEL  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1464  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	5	18	4.64	384/1470	4.64	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	16	4.44	567/1470	4.44	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1252	****	4.29	4.27	4.21	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	357/1413	4.56	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	21	4.84	98/1391	4.84	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.84	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	11	12	4.40	421/1347	4.40	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	0	11	12	4.32	664/1455	4.32	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	12	4.50	1070/1469	4.50	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	11	9	4.32	557/1451	4.32	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	613/1407	4.63	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	323/1404	4.94	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	356/1401	4.69	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	587/1398	4.50	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	10	6	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	563/1176	4.11	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	212/1276	4.71	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	215/1277	4.90	4.42	4.30	4.02	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	243/1271	4.86	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	196/ 763	4.47	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 236	****	4.18	4.22	4.02	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 248	****	4.08	4.23	4.12	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.54	4.33	4.15	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.33	4.28	4.17	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 214	****	4.29	4.16	4.13	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.53	4.59	4.40	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.90	4.70	4.88	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.67	4.66	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 74	****	4.51	4.50	4.56	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 71	****	4.13	4.16	4.29	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.44	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 42	****	4.60	4.17	4.29	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	4.60	4.48	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.40	4.18	3.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 30	****	4.60	4.30	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 45	****	3.47	4.42	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	24	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.60	4.48	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 43	****	4.40	4.62	4.70	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.40	4.71	4.63	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	4.40	4.66	4.40	****	

Course-Section: WMST 100 0101  
 Title INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES  
 Instructor: KUSHNER, MIKHEL  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1464  
 JUN 14, 2004  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	5	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	25	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: WMST 100H 0101  
 Title  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1465  
 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	0	0	9	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.22	4.29	4.13	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	716/1470	4.33	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1252	****	4.29	4.27	4.21	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	0	7	4.22	805/1413	4.22	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	129/1391	4.78	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	592/1347	4.22	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	953/1455	4.00	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1443/1469	3.78	4.63	4.70	4.65	3.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	332/1451	4.50	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	409/1407	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	263/1401	4.75	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.21	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/1176	****	3.80	3.96	3.84	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.10	4.06	3.81	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	448/1277	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.02	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	430/1271	4.67	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	281/ 763	4.33	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: WMST 322 0101  
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA  
 Instructor: GEORGE, EVA  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1466  
 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	4	19	4.68	347/1470	4.68	4.22	4.29	4.31	4.68	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	288/1470	4.68	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	129/1252	4.84	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.84	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	149/1413	4.80	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	185/1391	4.68	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.68	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	208/1347	4.64	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	249/1455	4.68	4.10	4.16	4.12	4.68	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	4.00	1380/1469	4.00	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	9	11	4.55	293/1451	4.55	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	18	4.68	544/1407	4.68	4.38	4.43	4.41	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.69	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	10	14	4.52	532/1401	4.52	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.52	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	359/1398	4.72	4.27	4.27	4.25	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	207/1176	4.58	3.80	3.96	3.97	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	254/1276	4.65	4.10	4.06	4.10	4.65	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	215/1277	4.90	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	203/1271	4.90	4.31	4.28	4.33	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	7	1	2	3	2	5	3.62	597/ 763	3.62	3.98	4.06	4.07	3.62	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 21	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 17	Under-grad 25 Non-major 3
84-150	15	3.00-3.49 12	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: WMST 338 0101  
 Title WOMEN AND LAW  
 Instructor: Andronici, Just  
 Enrollment: 31  
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1467  
 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	1	4	20	4.76	236/1470	4.76	4.22	4.29	4.31	4.76	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	9	15	4.56	408/1470	4.56	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	531/1252	4.45	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	294/1413	4.63	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	18	4.67	191/1391	4.67	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	19	4.68	182/1347	4.68	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.68	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	4	16	4.44	520/1455	4.44	4.10	4.16	4.12	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	23	2	4.08	1362/1469	4.08	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	13	8	4.32	557/1451	4.32	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.32	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	268/1407	4.84	4.38	4.43	4.41	4.84	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	508/1404	4.88	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	141/1401	4.88	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	23	4.88	156/1398	4.88	4.27	4.27	4.25	4.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	17	2	1	2	1	1	2.71	1111/1176	2.71	3.80	3.96	3.97	2.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	3	3	11	3.95	762/1276	3.95	4.10	4.06	4.10	3.95	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	416/1277	4.70	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	243/1271	4.85	4.31	4.28	4.33	4.85	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	16	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 763	****	3.98	4.06	4.07	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 15	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 6	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 25 Non-major 4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 6	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 17	
			? 0		

Course-Section: WMST 349 0101  
 Title WOMEN AND THEATRE  
 Instructor: McCULLY, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1468  
 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	4	13	4.50	539/1470	4.50	4.22	4.29	4.31	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	567/1470	4.45	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	8	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	292/1252	4.67	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	266/1413	4.65	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	2	12	4.30	481/1391	4.30	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	299/1347	4.53	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	2	5	2	9	4.00	953/1455	4.00	4.10	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	901/1469	4.74	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.74	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	379/1451	4.47	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.47	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	730/1407	4.53	4.38	4.43	4.41	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.69	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	469/1401	4.59	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.59	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	2	13	4.65	452/1398	4.65	4.27	4.27	4.25	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	555/1176	4.13	3.80	3.96	3.97	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	151/1276	4.82	4.10	4.06	4.10	4.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	129/1277	4.94	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.94	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	326/1271	4.76	4.31	4.28	4.33	4.76	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	253/ 763	4.38	3.98	4.06	4.07	4.38	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 248	****	4.08	4.23	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.53	4.59	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.90	4.70	4.60	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 64	****	4.67	4.66	4.85	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 74	****	4.51	4.50	4.64	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 71	****	4.13	4.16	4.34	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	4.00	4.34	4.63	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	4.60	4.17	4.14	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.40	4.18	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	3.47	4.42	4.58	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 11	Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B 3	
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 8 Under-grad 21 Non-major 7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	
				P 0	
				I 0	Electives 3 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
				? 2	Other 2

Course-Section: WMST 352 0101  
 Title GENDER & INFO TECHNOLO  
 Instructor: McDermott, M P  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1469  
 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	3	1	3	2	3	3.08	1435/1470	3.08	4.22	4.29	4.31	3.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1393/1470	3.25	4.19	4.23	4.22	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1252	****	4.29	4.27	4.27	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	3	2	3.25	1356/1413	3.25	4.19	4.24	4.27	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	1	6	3.75	968/1391	3.75	4.09	4.02	4.00	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	3	0	0	2	3	3.25	1247/1347	3.25	4.05	4.10	4.11	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	0	7	3.92	1066/1455	3.92	4.10	4.16	4.12	3.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	4	3	0	3.13	1355/1451	3.13	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	1	5	1	1	2.64	1392/1407	2.64	4.38	4.43	4.41	2.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	1260/1404	4.27	4.68	4.70	4.69	4.27	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	2	3	1	2.90	1363/1401	2.90	4.24	4.28	4.27	2.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	2	2	2	2.91	1342/1398	2.91	4.27	4.27	4.25	2.91	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	7	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	1165/1176	1.67	3.80	3.96	3.97	1.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	5	2	3.42	1058/1276	3.42	4.10	4.06	4.10	3.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	448/1277	4.67	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	505/1271	4.58	4.31	4.28	4.33	4.58	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	2	4	2	1	3.22	668/ 763	3.22	3.98	4.06	4.07	3.22	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		12
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	5

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: WMST 390A 0101  
 Title QUEER RPRTN IN FILM &  
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1470  
 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	4	4	19	4.56	486/1470	4.56	4.22	4.29	4.31	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	7	15	4.37	668/1470	4.37	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.37	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	519/1252	4.46	4.29	4.27	4.27	4.46	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	7	15	4.27	753/1413	4.27	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	5	15	4.26	530/1391	4.26	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	6	9	12	4.22	592/1347	4.22	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.22	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	4	17	4.46	492/1455	4.46	4.10	4.16	4.12	4.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	21	4.78	862/1469	4.78	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.78	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	7	12	5	3.92	968/1451	3.92	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	4	17	4.38	907/1407	4.38	4.38	4.43	4.41	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	26	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.69	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	3	6	15	4.31	816/1401	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	4	4	17	4.38	733/1398	4.38	4.27	4.27	4.25	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	29/1176	4.96	3.80	3.96	3.97	4.96	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	6	13	4.22	606/1276	4.22	4.10	4.06	4.10	4.22	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	3	2	17	4.48	618/1277	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.34	4.48	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	235/1271	4.86	4.31	4.28	4.33	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	2	1	2	2	10	4.00	421/ 763	4.00	3.98	4.06	4.07	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	4
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 13		Graduate
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	11
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: WMST 495 0101  
 Title RESEARCH & ACTIVISM SE  
 Instructor: GEORGE, EVA  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 1471  
 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	1	2	2	4.20	936/1470	4.20	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	632/1470	4.40	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1252	****	4.29	4.27	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	313/1413	4.60	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	530/1391	4.25	4.09	4.02	4.04	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	243/1347	4.60	4.05	4.10	4.15	4.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	953/1455	4.00	4.10	4.16	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1451	4.75	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	315/1407	4.80	4.38	4.43	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	693/1404	4.80	4.68	4.70	4.75	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	448/1401	4.60	4.24	4.28	4.32	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1398	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1176	5.00	3.80	3.96	4.05	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1276	5.00	4.10	4.06	4.19	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 763	5.00	3.98	4.06	4.22	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant