

Course Section: LLC 600 0101  
 Title LANG, LIT, & CULTURE  
 Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1079  
 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	6	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.83	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.58	4.19	4.19	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.87	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1617	4.83	4.56	4.15	4.24	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.76	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.63	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	127/1605	4.83	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.54	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.45	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1253/1311	2.33	3.26	3.85	3.89	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.72	4.05	4.18	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.77	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	199/1006	4.60	4.06	4.00	4.11	4.60	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.39	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.93	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.87	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 105	5.00	4.43	4.20	4.23	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 98	5.00	4.43	3.95	3.93	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: LLC 610 0101  
 Title THEORGIZING IDENTITY  
 Instructor: MCDERMOTT, PA  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1080  
 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	0	0	7	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.83	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	472/1666	4.57	4.58	4.19	4.19	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.87	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	0	6	4.43	612/1617	4.43	4.56	4.15	4.24	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1555	4.83	4.76	4.00	4.07	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	580/1543	4.33	4.63	4.06	4.27	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	759/1647	4.33	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	1190/1668	4.50	4.82	4.67	4.83	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.54	4.39	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.45	4.26	4.24	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	1269/1311	2.00	3.26	3.85	3.89	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.72	4.05	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	567/1502	4.57	4.77	4.26	4.46	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	776/1489	4.43	4.67	4.29	4.44	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	5	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	759/1006	3.50	4.06	4.00	4.11	3.50	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.41	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.39	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	38/ 97	4.80	4.93	4.36	4.38	4.80	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	40/ 92	4.60	4.87	4.22	4.36	4.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	84/ 105	3.80	4.43	4.20	4.23	3.80	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	68/ 98	3.80	4.43	3.95	3.93	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	****	3.97	4.31	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: LLC 611 0101  
 Title CONSTRUCTING RACE CLAS  
 Instructor: PINCUS, FRED  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1081  
 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	5	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.83	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.00	4.58	4.19	4.19	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.87	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	219/1617	4.75	4.56	4.15	4.24	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.76	4.00	4.07	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.63	4.06	4.27	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1428/1605	3.33	4.25	4.07	4.13	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1352/1514	3.67	4.54	4.39	4.37	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1193/1551	4.50	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1423/1503	3.00	4.41	4.24	4.22	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1319/1506	3.50	4.45	4.26	4.24	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1490	4.75	4.72	4.05	4.18	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	393/1502	4.75	4.77	4.26	4.46	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.67	4.29	4.44	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1006	****	4.06	4.00	4.11	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	4.93	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.43	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 98	****	4.43	3.95	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: LLC 645 0101  
 Title QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH  
 Instructor: OLIA, NEZHAT  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1082  
 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	5	4.44	676/1669	4.44	4.83	4.23	4.35	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.58	4.19	4.19	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	466/1421	4.60	4.87	4.24	4.33	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	394/1617	4.60	4.56	4.15	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	108/1555	4.89	4.76	4.00	4.07	4.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	250/1543	4.67	4.63	4.06	4.27	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	424/1647	4.56	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	591/1605	4.33	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	955/1514	4.40	4.54	4.39	4.37	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	986/1551	4.70	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.70	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	932/1503	4.20	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	770/1506	4.40	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	3	2	3.67	846/1311	3.67	3.26	3.85	3.89	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	4.20	4.72	4.05	4.18	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	754/1502	4.40	4.77	4.26	4.46	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.67	4.29	4.44	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	****	4.20	4.47	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: LLC 750A 0101  
 Title DOMESTIC VIOLENCE  
 Instructor: SOKOLOFF, NATAL  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1083  
 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	0	0	6	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.83	4.23	4.35	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	359/1666	4.67	4.58	4.19	4.19	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1421	****	4.87	4.24	4.33	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1334/1617	3.60	4.56	4.15	4.24	3.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1555	4.83	4.76	4.00	4.07	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	1195/1543	3.67	4.63	4.06	4.27	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1553/1647	2.83	4.29	4.12	4.15	2.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.82	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	1210/1605	3.75	4.25	4.07	4.13	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.50	4.54	4.39	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	1069/1506	4.00	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.26	3.85	3.89	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	192/1490	4.83	4.72	4.05	4.18	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	306/1502	4.83	4.77	4.26	4.46	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.67	4.29	4.44	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	729/1006	3.60	4.06	4.00	4.11	3.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: LLC 750B 0101  
 Title METHODS OF LLC RESEARC  
 Instructor: MALLISON, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 10  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1084  
 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	2	5	4.71	318/1669	4.71	4.83	4.23	4.35	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.58	4.19	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	265/1617	4.71	4.56	4.15	4.24	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.76	4.00	4.07	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.63	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1647	5.00	4.29	4.12	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1144/1668	4.57	4.82	4.67	4.83	4.57	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	473/1605	4.43	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	274/1514	4.86	4.54	4.39	4.37	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	650/1551	4.86	4.87	4.66	4.72	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.41	4.24	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	575/1506	4.57	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	232/1311	4.57	3.26	3.85	3.89	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	298/1490	4.71	4.72	4.05	4.18	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	286/1502	4.86	4.77	4.26	4.46	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.67	4.29	4.44	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	178/1006	4.67	4.06	4.00	4.11	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 112	****	5.00	4.38	4.39	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	4.93	4.36	4.38	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.87	4.22	4.36	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.43	4.20	4.23	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.43	3.95	3.93	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: LLC 890 0101  
 Title RES PROPOSAL SEMINAR  
 Instructor: MALLISON, CHRIS  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2006

Page 1085  
 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	1	2	4.67	389/1669	4.67	4.83	4.23	4.35	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	777/1666	4.33	4.58	4.19	4.19	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.87	4.24	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1617	5.00	4.56	4.15	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	492/1555	4.33	4.76	4.00	4.07	4.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.63	4.06	4.27	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	302/1647	4.67	4.29	4.12	4.15	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1068/1668	4.67	4.82	4.67	4.83	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.25	4.07	4.13	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1022/1514	4.33	4.54	4.39	4.37	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.87	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	800/1503	4.33	4.41	4.24	4.22	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.45	4.26	4.24	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.00	3.26	3.85	3.89	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.72	4.05	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.77	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.67	4.29	4.44	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	479/1006	4.00	4.06	4.00	4.11	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 112	5.00	5.00	4.38	4.39	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 97	5.00	4.93	4.36	4.38	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.87	4.22	4.36	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	51/ 105	4.50	4.43	4.20	4.23	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 98	4.50	4.43	3.95	3.93	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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