

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	5	6	13	4.33	790/1447	4.27	4.43	4.31	4.18	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	7	14	4.46	604/1447	4.30	4.45	4.27	4.30	4.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	19	0	2	0	0	3	3.80	****/1241	****	4.39	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	2	6	12	4.17	845/1402	4.23	4.51	4.24	4.15	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	15	4.38	485/1358	4.57	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	8	13	4.29	581/1316	4.32	4.40	4.14	3.99	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	1	7	12	4.08	925/1427	4.27	4.42	4.19	4.24	4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	12	10	4.29	1228/1447	4.38	4.72	4.69	4.68	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	1	12	5	4.11	797/1434	4.16	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	6	6	11	4.22	1071/1387	4.27	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	732/1387	4.80	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	6	14	4.48	649/1386	4.32	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	17	4.48	689/1380	4.45	4.54	4.32	4.31	4.48
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	3	2	6	10	4.10	616/1193	4.02	4.31	4.02	3.99	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	8	8	4.26	573/1172	4.27	4.51	4.15	3.95	4.26
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	521/1182	4.48	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	1	1	3	14	4.40	657/1170	4.53	4.69	4.38	4.17	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	3	8	7	4.05	415/ 800	4.10	4.08	4.06	3.95	4.05
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B 6			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 0	General 10	Under-grad 24	Non-major 24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GWST 100 02  
 Title Intro Gender & Women  
 Instructor: Kelber-kaye,Jod  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 810  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	1	3	2	6	17	4.21	919/1447	4.27	4.43	4.31	4.18	4.21
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	3	5	17	4.14	965/1447	4.30	4.45	4.27	4.30	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	23	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	****/1241	****	4.39	4.33	4.25	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	2	10	14	4.29	735/1402	4.23	4.51	4.24	4.15	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	25	4.76	173/1358	4.57	4.53	4.11	4.03	4.76
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	8	16	4.34	542/1316	4.32	4.40	4.14	3.99	4.34
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	4	4	19	4.46	513/1427	4.27	4.42	4.19	4.24	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	14	4.46	1109/1447	4.38	4.72	4.69	4.68	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	4	11	9	4.21	691/1434	4.16	4.24	4.10	4.10	4.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	3	2	4	16	4.32	980/1387	4.27	4.59	4.46	4.46	4.32
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	0	3	22	4.77	844/1387	4.80	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	2	4	4	15	4.15	962/1386	4.32	4.55	4.32	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	2	4	18	4.42	739/1380	4.45	4.54	4.32	4.31	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	5	0	4	3	4	10	3.95	705/1193	4.02	4.31	4.02	3.99	3.95
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	559/1172	4.27	4.51	4.15	3.95	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	638/1182	4.48	4.66	4.35	4.18	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	480/1170	4.53	4.69	4.38	4.17	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	389/ 800	4.10	4.08	4.06	3.95	4.14
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	28	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: GWST 100 02  
 Title Intro Gender & Women  
 Instructor: Kelber-kaye, Jod  
 Enrollment: 35  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 810  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	1	A	16	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	8	Under-grad	29	Non-major	29
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	11	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GWST 200 01  
 Title Studies In Fem Activis  
 Instructor: Kelber-kaye,Jod  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 29

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 811  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	16	11	4.31	810/1447	4.31	4.43	4.31	4.31	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	6	10	12	4.10	993/1447	4.10	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	22	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	****/1241	****	4.39	4.33	4.35	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	7	16	4.36	665/1402	4.36	4.51	4.24	4.24	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	1	7	17	4.28	590/1358	4.28	4.53	4.11	4.12	4.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	11	13	4.14	729/1316	4.14	4.40	4.14	4.08	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	9	14	4.21	835/1427	4.21	4.42	4.19	4.14	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	511/1447	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.70	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	1	5	10	8	3.92	956/1434	3.92	4.24	4.10	3.97	3.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	2	4	7	14	4.11	1144/1387	4.11	4.59	4.46	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	27	4.96	211/1387	4.96	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	5	7	14	4.14	971/1386	4.14	4.55	4.32	4.24	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	7	16	4.25	887/1380	4.25	4.54	4.32	4.30	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	4	8	10	3.96	694/1193	3.96	4.31	4.02	4.04	3.96
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	19	0	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.51	4.15	4.12	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	19	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	400/1182	4.70	4.66	4.35	4.30	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	624/1170	4.44	4.69	4.38	4.32	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	20	8	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 800	****	4.08	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 17	Required for Majors 16	Graduate 0 Major 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 29 Non-major 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 10	F 1	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: GWST 321 01  
 Title: Queer Reprnt Film & T  
 Instructor: Householder, Apr  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 812  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	2	3	4	18	4.41	723/1447	4.41	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	20	4.67	352/1447	4.67	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	17	4.33	717/1241	4.33	4.39	4.33	4.33	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	20	4.62	369/1402	4.62	4.51	4.24	4.24	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	6	16	4.26	608/1358	4.26	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	8	16	4.44	455/1316	4.44	4.40	4.14	4.13	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	4	2	5	16	4.22	811/1427	4.22	4.42	4.19	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	194/1447	4.96	4.72	4.69	4.65	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	6	11	6	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	160/1387	4.92	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	366/1386	4.72	4.55	4.32	4.30	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	593/1380	4.56	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	22	4.84	86/1193	4.84	4.31	4.02	4.05	4.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	181/1172	4.80	4.51	4.15	4.24	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	410/1182	4.69	4.66	4.35	4.42	4.69
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.69	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	527/ 800	3.88	4.08	4.06	4.12	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 14						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	1	Under-grad	27	Non-major	23
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	7				
			? 1						

Course-Section: GWST 322 01  
 Title Women And The Media  
 Instructor: Jen,Clare C  
 Enrollment: 41  
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 813  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	5	24	4.77	298/1447	4.58	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.77
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	25	4.80	196/1447	4.70	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	24	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/1241	4.82	4.39	4.33	4.33	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	26	4.87	121/1402	4.70	4.51	4.24	4.24	4.87
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	8	21	4.67	237/1358	4.73	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	6	22	4.60	292/1316	4.62	4.40	4.14	4.13	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	133/1427	4.70	4.42	4.19	4.15	4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	10	17	4.52	1072/1447	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.65	4.52
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	7	15	4.61	278/1434	4.55	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.61
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	322/1387	4.85	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	27	4.93	422/1387	4.92	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	21	4.74	328/1386	4.73	4.55	4.32	4.30	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	22	4.75	339/1380	4.65	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	3	24	4.82	93/1193	4.62	4.31	4.02	4.05	4.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	17	4.76	210/1172	4.65	4.51	4.15	4.24	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	382/1182	4.69	4.66	4.35	4.42	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	275/1170	4.85	4.69	4.38	4.49	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	1	2	3	4	10	4.00	423/ 800	3.85	4.08	4.06	4.12	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 18	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 7	Under-grad 30	Non-major 28
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 13	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: GWST 322 02  
 Title Women And The Media  
 Instructor: Jen,Clare C  
 Enrollment: 39  
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 814  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	3	0	1	0	1	9	14	4.40	723/1447	4.58	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	426/1447	4.70	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	14	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	222/1241	4.82	4.39	4.33	4.33	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	1	9	14	4.54	448/1402	4.70	4.51	4.24	4.24	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	137/1358	4.73	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	256/1316	4.62	4.40	4.14	4.13	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	385/1427	4.70	4.42	4.19	4.15	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	836/1447	4.63	4.72	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	1	1	5	13	4.50	341/1434	4.55	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	230/1387	4.85	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	24	4.92	422/1387	4.92	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	5	19	4.72	366/1386	4.73	4.55	4.32	4.30	4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	593/1380	4.65	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	3	5	15	4.42	367/1193	4.62	4.31	4.02	4.05	4.42
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	7	15	4.54	355/1172	4.65	4.51	4.15	4.24	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	430/1182	4.69	4.66	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	295/1170	4.85	4.69	4.38	4.49	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	1	3	5	3	8	3.70	600/ 800	3.85	4.08	4.06	4.12	3.70

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 16	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 8	Under-grad 28	Non-major 28
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	9	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 10	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: GWST 338 01  
 Title Women And Law  
 Instructor: Forshner,Carrie  
 Enrollment: 37  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 815  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	2	4	4	10	3.95	1108/1447	3.95	4.43	4.31	4.32	3.95
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	4	4	4	7	3.60	1286/1447	3.60	4.45	4.27	4.23	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	2	6	4	3.10	1212/1241	3.10	4.39	4.33	4.33	3.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	3	8	6	3.80	1139/1402	3.80	4.51	4.24	4.24	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	2	6	7	3.74	1036/1358	3.74	4.53	4.11	4.10	3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	7	5	3.48	1145/1316	3.48	4.40	4.14	4.13	3.48
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	4	5	8	3.90	1077/1427	3.90	4.42	4.19	4.15	3.90
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	619/1447	4.86	4.72	4.69	4.65	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	2	1	2	6	3	3.50	1238/1434	3.50	4.24	4.10	4.09	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	707/1387	4.83	4.92	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	4	4	9	4.17	953/1386	4.17	4.55	4.32	4.30	4.17
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	3	5	9	4.22	915/1380	4.22	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.22
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	775/1193	3.88	4.31	4.02	4.05	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	6	4.08	679/1172	4.08	4.51	4.15	4.24	4.08
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	1	10	4.54	534/1182	4.54	4.66	4.35	4.42	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	3	1	8	4.23	775/1170	4.23	4.69	4.38	4.49	4.23
4. Were special techniques successful	8	8	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	****/ 800	****	4.08	4.06	4.12	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 9	General	1
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 1		

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



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	1	4	16	4.55	540/1447	4.55	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	389/1447	4.64	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	10	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.39	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	0	3	16	4.65	325/1402	4.65	4.51	4.24	4.24	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	87/1358	4.91	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	19	4.77	150/1316	4.77	4.40	4.14	4.13	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	86/1427	4.91	4.42	4.19	4.15	4.91
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	928/1447	4.70	4.72	4.69	4.65	4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	516/1434	4.35	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	1	17	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	558/1386	4.55	4.55	4.32	4.30	4.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	2	16	4.65	477/1380	4.65	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.65
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	323/1193	4.47	4.31	4.02	4.05	4.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	218/1172	4.75	4.51	4.15	4.24	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.66	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	0	0	10	4.73	427/1170	4.73	4.69	4.38	4.49	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 800	****	4.08	4.06	4.12	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 5	Under-grad 22	Non-major 15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 1			

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	9	17	4.59	485/1447	4.59	4.43	4.31	4.32	4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	22	4.70	303/1447	4.70	4.45	4.27	4.23	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	14	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	195/1241	4.85	4.39	4.33	4.33	4.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	21	4.81	165/1402	4.81	4.51	4.24	4.24	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	21	4.73	187/1358	4.73	4.53	4.11	4.10	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	20	4.73	181/1316	4.73	4.40	4.14	4.13	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	154/1427	4.81	4.42	4.19	4.15	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	388/1447	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.65	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	11	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	420/1434	4.44	4.24	4.10	4.09	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	80/1387	4.96	4.59	4.46	4.44	4.96
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.55	4.32	4.30	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	8	19	4.70	406/1380	4.70	4.54	4.32	4.32	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	18	4.64	199/1193	4.64	4.31	4.02	4.05	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	135/1172	4.89	4.51	4.15	4.24	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	219/1182	4.89	4.66	4.35	4.42	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	134/1170	4.94	4.69	4.38	4.49	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	100/ 800	4.76	4.08	4.06	4.12	4.76
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.26	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.36	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.11	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.02	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.17	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	****	4.56	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.41	2.87	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	****	4.42	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	****	4.09	3.38	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	****	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	****	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	****	4.43	4.50	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Course-Section: GWST 352 01  
 Title Gender & Info Technolo  
 Instructor: Benvenga, Michel  
 Enrollment: 34  
 Questionnaires: 27

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 817  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	3	Under-grad	27	Non-major	26
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	11	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: GWST 495 01  
 Title Colloquium: Res & Actv  
 Instructor: McCann,Carole R  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2010

Page 818  
 JUN 28, 2010  
 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	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.80	4.43	4.31	4.43	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	196/1447	4.80	4.45	4.27	4.31	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.39	4.33	4.41	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1402	5.00	4.51	4.24	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	137/1358	4.80	4.53	4.11	4.15	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	292/1316	4.60	4.40	4.14	4.27	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	842/1427	4.20	4.42	4.19	4.20	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	158/1434	4.75	4.24	4.10	4.17	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	902/1387	4.40	4.59	4.46	4.48	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.92	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	253/1386	4.80	4.55	4.32	4.34	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	273/1380	4.80	4.54	4.32	4.34	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.31	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	218/1172	4.75	4.51	4.15	4.25	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	347/1182	4.75	4.66	4.35	4.49	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1170	4.75	4.69	4.38	4.51	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	423/ 800	4.00	4.08	4.06	4.19	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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