

Course Section: GWST 100 0101
 Title INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 987
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	9	18	4.67	389/1669	4.50	4.53	4.23	4.02	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	18	4.59	450/1666	4.60	4.41	4.19	4.11	4.59	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	26	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.74	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	19	4.63	370/1617	4.51	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	22	4.85	124/1555	4.79	4.59	4.00	3.92	4.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	6	19	4.65	258/1543	4.40	4.26	4.06	3.86	4.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	5	7	14	4.35	744/1647	4.49	4.45	4.12	4.06	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	6	14	5	3.88	1596/1668	3.94	3.85	4.67	4.62	3.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	1	0	9	16	4.54	350/1605	4.27	4.03	4.07	3.96	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	8	17	4.68	569/1514	4.55	4.23	4.39	4.32	4.68	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	7	17	4.71	335/1503	4.55	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	66/1506	4.88	4.45	4.26	4.17	4.96	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	11	4	0	2	5	3	3.21	1069/1311	3.11	3.86	3.85	3.68	3.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	184/1490	4.62	4.53	4.05	3.85	4.85	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	2	22	4.69	459/1502	4.65	4.65	4.26	4.06	4.69	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	25	4.96	112/1489	4.98	4.59	4.29	4.07	4.96	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	1	4	11	5	3.82	639/1006	3.69	3.70	4.00	3.81	3.82	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8	Graduate	0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	8
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0	Under-grad	27
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

Course Section: GWST 100 0201
 Title INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 988
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	4	9	4.33	816/1669	4.50	4.53	4.23	4.02	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	439/1666	4.60	4.41	4.19	4.11	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	641/1617	4.51	4.46	4.15	3.99	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	183/1555	4.79	4.59	4.00	3.92	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	783/1543	4.40	4.26	4.06	3.86	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	324/1647	4.49	4.45	4.12	4.06	4.64	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	1	4.00	1530/1668	3.94	3.85	4.67	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	918/1605	4.27	4.03	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	5	8	4.43	923/1514	4.55	4.23	4.39	4.32	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	6	8	4.40	719/1503	4.55	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	286/1506	4.88	4.45	4.26	4.17	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	9	2	0	1	2	1	3.00	1115/1311	3.11	3.86	3.85	3.68	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	10	4.40	558/1490	4.62	4.53	4.05	3.85	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	540/1502	4.65	4.65	4.26	4.06	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1489	4.98	4.59	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	1	5	7	1	3.57	738/1006	3.69	3.70	4.00	3.81	3.57	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.50	4.42	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: GWST 100 0201
 Title INTRO WOMEN'S STUDIES
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 988
 JAN 18, 2007
 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 11	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 1	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General 8	Under-grad 15 Non-major 15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course Section: GWST 100H 0101
 Title
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 989
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	1173/1669	4.00	4.53	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1273/1666	3.86	4.41	4.19	4.11	3.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.74	4.24	4.11	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1273/1617	3.71	4.46	4.15	3.99	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	195/1555	4.71	4.59	4.00	3.92	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1060/1543	3.86	4.26	4.06	3.86	3.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	828/1647	4.29	4.45	4.12	4.06	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1620/1668	3.71	3.85	4.67	4.62	3.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	3	3	0	3.50	1357/1605	3.50	4.03	4.07	3.96	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1288/1514	3.86	4.23	4.39	4.32	3.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1066/1503	4.00	4.37	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	3.57	1305/1506	3.57	4.45	4.26	4.17	3.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1311	****	3.86	3.85	3.68	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	979/1490	3.86	4.53	4.05	3.85	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.65	4.26	4.06	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	2	0	0	4	3.57	1249/1489	3.57	4.59	4.29	4.07	3.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	862/1006	3.29	3.70	4.00	3.81	3.29	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.26	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: GWST 200 0101
 Title STUDIES IN FEM ACTIVIS
 Instructor: KELBER-KAYE, JO
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 990
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.53	4.23	4.34	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	4.86	4.41	4.19	4.29	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.35	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	265/1617	4.71	4.46	4.15	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.59	4.00	3.96	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	325/1543	4.57	4.26	4.06	4.10	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	250/1647	4.71	4.45	4.12	4.19	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	1451/1668	4.14	3.85	4.67	4.59	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	170/1605	4.75	4.03	4.07	4.15	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1199/1514	4.00	4.23	4.39	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	954/1551	4.71	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.37	4.24	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	642/1506	4.50	4.45	4.26	4.33	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	219/1311	4.60	3.86	3.85	3.96	4.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.53	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.36	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	3	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	759/1006	3.50	3.70	4.00	3.99	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 7 Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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 3	
			? 0		

Course Section: GWST 210 0101
 Title LESBIAN AND GAY STUDIE
 Instructor: HAGOVSKY, ELIZA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 991
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1090/1669	4.11	4.53	4.23	4.34	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	1257/1666	3.88	4.41	4.19	4.29	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	746/1421	4.33	4.74	4.24	4.35	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	831/1617	4.22	4.46	4.15	4.24	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	4	3.89	955/1555	3.89	4.59	4.00	3.96	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1344/1543	3.25	4.26	4.06	4.10	3.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	0	4	3.78	1265/1647	3.78	4.45	4.12	4.19	3.78	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	6	2	0	3.25	1648/1668	3.25	3.85	4.67	4.59	3.25	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	2	0	2	2	1	3.00	1501/1605	3.00	4.03	4.07	4.15	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	3	2	2	3.44	1399/1514	3.44	4.23	4.39	4.39	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	1152/1551	4.56	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.56	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1225/1503	3.78	4.37	4.24	4.29	3.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1184/1506	3.89	4.45	4.26	4.33	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	3	1	1	3.17	1084/1311	3.17	3.86	3.85	3.96	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	3	3.67	1088/1490	3.67	4.53	4.05	4.11	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1129/1502	3.89	4.65	4.26	4.31	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	3	1	3	3.56	1258/1489	3.56	4.59	4.29	4.36	3.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	2	0	3	1	1	2.86	948/1006	2.86	3.70	4.00	3.99	2.86	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: GWST 322 0101
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: LEWIS, MELISSA
 Enrollment: 36
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 992
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	3	19	4.78	231/1669	4.65	4.53	4.23	4.28	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	7	13	4.39	703/1666	4.36	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	305/1421	4.68	4.74	4.24	4.25	4.74	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	242/1617	4.68	4.46	4.15	4.22	4.74	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	5	16	4.64	243/1555	4.54	4.59	4.00	4.03	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	0	1	8	11	4.50	390/1543	4.52	4.26	4.06	4.14	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	5	17	4.65	313/1647	4.57	4.45	4.12	4.14	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	1	14	7	4.13	1457/1668	3.42	3.85	4.67	4.68	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	10	4	4.06	884/1605	3.98	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	4	11	4.37	993/1514	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.46	4.37	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	567/1551	4.83	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	702/1503	4.35	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	623/1506	4.43	4.45	4.26	4.30	4.53	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	3	4	11	4.44	305/1311	4.28	3.86	3.85	3.97	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	148/1490	4.72	4.53	4.05	4.11	4.89	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	513/1502	4.73	4.65	4.26	4.28	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	400/1489	4.83	4.59	4.29	4.35	4.79	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	393/1006	3.83	3.70	4.00	4.10	4.22	
Field Work															
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	8	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	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	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: GWST 322 0201
 Title WOMEN AND THE MEDIA
 Instructor: HAGOVSKY, ELIZA
 Enrollment: 37
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 993
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	9	19	4.52	578/1669	4.65	4.53	4.23	4.28	4.52	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	4	7	18	4.32	789/1666	4.36	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	23	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	441/1421	4.68	4.74	4.24	4.25	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	23	4.61	382/1617	4.68	4.46	4.15	4.22	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	4	22	4.45	389/1555	4.54	4.59	4.00	4.03	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	22	4.55	353/1543	4.52	4.26	4.06	4.14	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	5	6	20	4.48	515/1647	4.57	4.45	4.12	4.14	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	17	6	4	3	2.71	1659/1668	3.42	3.85	4.67	4.68	2.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	10	9	9	3.90	1100/1605	3.98	4.03	4.07	4.09	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	0	4	11	11	4.15	1148/1514	4.26	4.23	4.39	4.46	4.15	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	23	4.78	843/1551	4.83	4.87	4.66	4.70	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	2	4	5	16	4.30	843/1503	4.35	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	3	4	18	4.33	838/1506	4.43	4.45	4.26	4.30	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	1	6	6	11	4.13	525/1311	4.28	3.86	3.85	3.97	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	2	3	18	4.54	422/1490	4.72	4.53	4.05	4.11	4.54	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	306/1502	4.73	4.65	4.26	4.28	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	22	4.88	309/1489	4.83	4.59	4.29	4.35	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	4	9	6	4	3.43	794/1006	3.83	3.70	4.00	4.10	3.43	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.53	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	5.00	4.36	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	29	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.67	4.22	4.47	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	29	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.67	4.20	4.45	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	29	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	5.00	3.95	4.15	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.29	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	3.59	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	3.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	****	4.34	4.03	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.13	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.45	4.13	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	3.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	****	4.34	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	16	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	10	C	0	General	9	Under-grad	31	Non-major	31
84-150	13	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						

Course Section: GWST 390B 0101
 Title: GENDER & THE ENVIRONME
 Instructor: STUPSKI, KAREN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 994
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	199/1669	4.82	4.53	4.23	4.28	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	173/1666	4.82	4.41	4.19	4.20	4.82	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.74	4.24	4.25	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	358/1617	4.64	4.46	4.15	4.22	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.59	4.00	4.03	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	353/1543	4.55	4.26	4.06	4.14	4.55	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	241/1647	4.73	4.45	4.12	4.14	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	5.00	3.85	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.03	4.07	4.09	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	240/1514	4.88	4.23	4.39	4.46	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	154/1503	4.88	4.37	4.24	4.28	4.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.45	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	264/1311	4.50	3.86	3.85	3.97	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.53	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.65	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.59	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	105/1006	4.88	3.70	4.00	4.10	4.88	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.53	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	5.00	4.36	4.12	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	38/ 92	4.67	4.67	4.22	4.47	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	42/ 105	4.67	4.67	4.20	4.45	4.67	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	5.00	3.95	4.15	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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