

Course-Section: LLC 600A 0101
 Title INTRODUCTION TO LLC
 Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1041
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	830/1649	4.36	4.67	4.28	4.46	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	756/1648	4.36	4.60	4.23	4.34	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1375	****	4.75	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.58	4.20	4.35	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	754/1533	4.09	4.50	4.04	4.28	4.09	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.88	4.10	4.35	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	894/1623	4.18	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	664/1646	4.90	4.86	4.69	4.81	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	812/1564	4.38	4.47	4.28	4.41	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.48	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1270/1352	2.80	4.08	3.98	4.10	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	749/1384	4.13	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	521/1382	4.63	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.63	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.70	4.30	4.56	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	0	3	1	1	1	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	4.16	3.95	4.03	3.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	31/ 85	4.75	4.88	4.47	4.50	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 92	4.75	4.88	4.35	4.42	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/ 288	4.75	4.88	3.68	3.87	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	2	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	7	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LLC 644 0101
 Title METHODS OF LLC RESEARC
 Instructor: MALLINSON, CHRI
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1042
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	3	6	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.67	4.28	4.46	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	161/1648	4.89	4.60	4.23	4.34	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	7	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1375	****	4.75	4.27	4.44	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.58	4.20	4.35	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.50	4.04	4.28	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	123/1512	4.88	4.88	4.10	4.35	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	135/1623	4.88	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1081/1646	4.63	4.86	4.69	4.81	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	288/1621	4.60	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	273/1568	4.89	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.89	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	473/1564	4.67	4.47	4.28	4.41	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	901/1559	4.33	4.48	4.29	4.41	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	624/1352	4.11	4.08	3.98	4.10	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	613/1384	4.33	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	483/1382	4.67	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	285/1368	4.89	4.70	4.30	4.56	4.89	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	0	1	7	4.44	249/ 948	4.44	4.16	3.95	4.03	4.44	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	5.00	4.54	4.63	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.88	4.47	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	****	5.00	4.43	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.88	4.35	4.42	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.88	3.68	3.87	****	

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 0		Graduate 7
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	8

Course-Section: LLC 645 0101
 Title QUANT RESEARCH MTHDS I
 Instructor: GALINDO, CLAUDI
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1043
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.67	4.28	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1347/1648	3.75	4.60	4.23	4.34	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	546/1375	4.50	4.75	4.27	4.44	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.58	4.20	4.35	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	624/1533	4.25	4.50	4.04	4.28	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	815/1623	4.25	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1429/1621	3.33	4.40	4.06	4.20	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1297/1564	3.75	4.47	4.28	4.41	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.48	4.29	4.41	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1049/1352	3.50	4.08	3.98	4.10	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	796/1368	4.33	4.70	4.30	4.56	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	776/ 948	3.33	4.16	3.95	4.03	3.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750C 0101
 Title GLOBALIZED COMMUNICATI
 Instructor: BICKEL, BEVERLY
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1044
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.67	4.28	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.60	4.23	4.34	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.58	4.20	4.35	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.50	4.04	4.28	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.59	4.16	4.29	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.40	4.06	4.20	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.52	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.83	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.41	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.41	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.08	3.98	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.54	4.08	4.30	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.70	4.30	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.16	3.95	4.03	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750D 0101
 Title THEORIES OF FEMINISM
 Instructor: MCCANN, CAROLE
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1045
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.67	4.28	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.60	4.23	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.75	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.58	4.20	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.50	4.04	4.28	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1623	5.00	4.59	4.16	4.29	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1646	4.50	4.86	4.69	4.81	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.56	4.43	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.88	4.70	4.83	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.47	4.28	4.41	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.48	4.29	4.41	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.70	4.30	4.56	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.16	3.95	4.03	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750E 0101
 Title LITERACY ACROSS THE AG
 Instructor: FILBERT, TERESA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1046
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	4.67	433/1649	4.67	4.67	4.28	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	362/1648	4.67	4.60	4.23	4.34	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.58	4.20	4.35	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.50	4.04	4.28	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.81	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	595/1621	4.33	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1460/1568	3.50	4.56	4.43	4.52	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1071/1572	4.67	4.88	4.70	4.83	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.47	4.28	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.41	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.08	3.98	4.10	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	774/1382	4.33	4.73	4.29	4.52	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.70	4.30	4.56	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 890 0101
 Title RES PROPOSAL SEMINAR
 Instructor: GALINDO, CLAUDI
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 1047
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	4.50	644/1649	4.50	4.67	4.28	4.46	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.60	4.23	4.34	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1067/1595	4.00	4.58	4.20	4.35	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.50	4.04	4.28	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.88	4.10	4.35	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.50	4.59	4.16	4.29	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.86	4.69	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.40	4.06	4.20	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.56	4.43	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.88	4.70	4.83	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.47	4.28	4.41	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.48	4.29	4.41	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1384	4.50	4.54	4.08	4.30	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.73	4.29	4.52	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.50	4.70	4.30	4.56	4.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 88	5.00	5.00	4.54	4.63	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.88	4.47	4.50	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.88	4.35	4.42	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	4.88	3.68	3.87	5.00	

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
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		2
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 2		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		