

Course-Section: MLL 190 1
 Title The World Of Language
 Instructor: Westphal, German
 Enrollment: 40
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1021
 MAR 22, 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	2	2	1	4	5	3.57	1378/1509	4.23	4.42	4.31	4.18	3.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	5	2	4	3.36	1415/1509	4.10	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	3	5	3.64	1123/1287	4.27	4.48	4.30	4.24	3.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	5	0	5	3.73	1207/1459	4.12	4.32	4.22	4.11	3.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	4	4	3.92	921/1406	4.13	4.19	4.09	4.02	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	925/1384	4.01	4.17	4.11	3.98	3.92
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	5	3.79	1184/1489	4.25	4.07	4.17	4.20	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	1	9	3	3.93	1435/1506	4.44	4.55	4.67	4.66	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	5	1	3.50	1241/1463	4.12	4.16	4.09	4.02	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	3	2	6	2	3.36	1386/1438	4.18	4.48	4.46	4.44	3.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1383/1421	4.33	4.75	4.73	4.66	3.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	3	4	3	1	2.85	1383/1411	3.88	4.39	4.31	4.27	2.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	4	2	3	3.23	1324/1405	4.09	4.45	4.32	4.27	3.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	2	3	1	5	3.38	1038/1236	4.09	3.92	4.00	3.87	3.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1045/1260	4.01	4.32	4.14	3.95	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1104/1255	4.07	4.53	4.33	4.15	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	5	1	3	3.50	1143/1258	4.21	4.46	4.38	4.18	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	771/ 873	3.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	3.25
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	3.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.29	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.28	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 6	General 2	Under-grad 14	Non-major 13
84-150	1	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MLL 190 2
 Title The World Of Language
 Instructor: Field,Thomas T
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1022
 MAR 22, 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	1	3	38	4.88	176/1509	4.23	4.42	4.31	4.18	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	36	4.83	175/1509	4.10	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	127/1287	4.27	4.48	4.48	4.30	4.24
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	9	1	0	3	6	23	4.52	443/1459	4.12	4.32	4.22	4.11	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	10	25	4.33	502/1406	4.13	4.19	4.09	4.02	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	12	2	0	5	9	14	4.10	751/1384	4.01	4.17	4.11	3.98	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	32	4.71	224/1489	4.25	4.07	4.17	4.20	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	292/1506	4.44	4.55	4.67	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	10	28	4.74	164/1463	4.12	4.16	4.09	4.02	4.74
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	5.00	1/1438	4.18	4.48	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	41	4.98	161/1421	4.33	4.75	4.73	4.66	4.98
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	38	4.90	138/1411	3.88	4.39	4.31	4.27	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	4.95	86/1405	4.09	4.45	4.32	4.27	4.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	2	36	4.80	100/1236	4.09	3.92	4.00	3.87	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	1	2	5	17	4.52	402/1260	4.01	4.32	4.14	3.95	4.52
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	1	0	2	3	18	4.54	547/1255	4.07	4.53	4.33	4.15	4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	1	0	23	4.92	212/1258	4.21	4.46	4.38	4.18	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	18	20	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	****/ 873	3.25	4.14	4.03	3.89	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	40	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	39	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	39	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.16	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	39	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	39	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.92	****
Self Paced														
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	41	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	6	0.00-0.99 2	A 28	Required for Majors 23	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	8	1.00-1.99 1	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 8	Under-grad 42 Non-major 28
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 17	F 0	Electives 5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MLL 210 1
 Title Africa: Cult/Developmn
 Instructor: Badru,Lateef Ol
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1023
 MAR 22, 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	5	4	21	4.38	756/1509	4.38	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	5	10	14	4.09	1020/1509	4.09	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	11	11	3.91	1020/1287	3.91	4.48	4.30	4.35	3.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	7	3	20	4.25	770/1459	4.25	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	4	5	3	18	4.06	768/1406	4.06	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	6	6	18	4.29	579/1384	4.29	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	9	10	8	3.68	1232/1489	3.68	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	12	19	4.56	1022/1506	4.56	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	1	0	0	8	7	4	3.79	1076/1463	3.79	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.79
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	5	22	4.57	725/1438	4.57	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	2	26	4.73	915/1421	4.73	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	1	6	21	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	3	5	20	4.52	624/1405	4.52	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	1	4	5	5	11	3.81	824/1236	3.81	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.81
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	487/1260	4.43	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	5	2	13	4.29	762/1255	4.29	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	770/1258	4.33	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	11	8	1	1	2	3	6	3.92	517/ 873	3.92	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.92
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	29	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	30	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: MLL 210 1
 Title Africa: Cult/Developmn
 Instructor: Badru,Lateef O1
 Enrollment: 43
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1023
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	17	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	14	Under-grad	32	Non-major	32
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MLL 213 1
 Title Film And Society Spain
 Instructor: Bell,Alan S
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1024
 MAR 22, 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	1	9	15	11	3.92	1204/1509	3.92	4.42	4.31	4.34	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	11	11	8	3.46	1388/1509	3.46	4.39	4.26	4.32	3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	12	6	11	5	3.14	1241/1287	3.14	4.48	4.30	4.35	3.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	6	8	10	10	3.49	1319/1459	3.49	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.49
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	5	12	5	6	2.89	1363/1406	2.89	4.19	4.09	4.09	2.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	6	3	8	11	5	3.18	1299/1384	3.18	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	5	7	6	17	3.84	1155/1489	3.84	4.07	4.17	4.19	3.84
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	0	1	2	32	4.78	820/1506	4.78	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	3	0	1	10	13	2	3.62	1200/1463	3.62	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	7	15	11	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	2	30	4.82	742/1421	4.82	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	3	5	12	14	4.09	1010/1411	4.09	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	4	7	9	14	3.97	1072/1405	3.97	4.45	4.32	4.39	3.97
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	3	5	22	4.55	248/1236	4.55	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	4	4	9	10	3.82	900/1260	3.82	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	3	6	9	10	3.93	974/1255	3.93	4.53	4.33	4.37	3.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	4	5	10	8	3.71	1083/1258	3.71	4.46	4.38	4.44	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	9	21	1	2	1	2	1	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.14	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	30	6	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	33	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	32	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	32	2	0	1	2	0	0	2.67	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	32	3	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	29	3	1	1	0	3	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	31	1	0	1	1	3	0	3.40	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	31	1	0	4	0	0	1	2.60	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	32	1	0	3	0	0	1	2.75	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	33	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	32	0	2	1	1	1	0	2.20	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	31	2	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	31	2	1	2	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	31	3	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	31	0	1	1	2	2	0	2.83	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	31	4	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	30	2	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	30	3	1	0	3	0	0	2.50	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	30	4	0	2	1	0	0	2.33	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: MLL 213 1
 Title Film And Society Spain
 Instructor: Bell, Alan S
 Enrollment: 47
 Questionnaires: 37

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1024
 MAR 22, 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	8	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	14						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	4	C	10	General	21	Under-grad	37	Non-major	36
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 230 1
 Title World Lang Communities
 Instructor: May,Brigitte Z
 Enrollment: 45
 Questionnaires: 32

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1025
 MAR 22, 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	2	0	1	2	6	7	14	4.03	1093/1509	4.03	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.03
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	6	8	14	4.13	982/1509	4.13	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	5	6	18	4.33	708/1287	4.33	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	5	1	1	4	13	6	3.88	1103/1459	3.88	4.32	4.22	4.30	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	4	9	14	4.10	739/1406	4.10	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.10
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	4	4	2	3	8	8	3.56	1163/1384	3.56	4.17	4.11	4.09	3.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	3	2	9	14	4.00	986/1489	4.00	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	19	10	4.34	1199/1506	4.34	4.55	4.67	4.61	4.34
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	1	5	17	1	3.75	1101/1463	3.75	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	4	14	9	4.19	1122/1438	4.19	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	768/1421	4.81	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	3	12	10	4.07	1015/1411	4.07	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	1	3	10	10	3.96	1081/1405	3.96	4.45	4.32	4.39	3.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	3	4	2	2	8	7	3.52	974/1236	3.52	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.52
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	1	7	6	4.13	696/1260	4.13	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	17	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	665/1255	4.40	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	17	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	444/1258	4.73	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	17	2	0	0	6	2	5	3.92	517/ 873	3.92	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.92

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 18	Graduate 0	Major 7
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 9		
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	Under-grad 32	Non-major 25
84-150	9	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 270 1
 Title Russian Culture/Civil
 Instructor: Rusinko, Elaine
 Enrollment: 41
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1026
 MAR 22, 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	4	8	17	4.29	842/1509	4.29	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	5	8	15	4.10	1020/1509	4.10	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	3	3	8	16	4.23	795/1287	4.23	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.23
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	5	3	8	14	4.03	958/1459	4.03	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.03
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	6	19	4.47	377/1406	4.47	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	6	8	13	4.03	790/1384	4.03	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.03
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	6	12	11	4.17	844/1489	4.17	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	9	17	3	3.79	1465/1506	3.79	4.55	4.67	4.61	3.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	1	6	12	9	3.83	1036/1463	3.83	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	5	22	4.69	559/1438	4.69	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	3	25	4.76	881/1421	4.76	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	6	3	20	4.48	641/1411	4.48	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.48
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	6	20	4.55	587/1405	4.55	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	126/1236	4.75	3.92	4.00	4.11	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	3	0	3	5	5	3.56	1024/1260	3.56	4.32	4.14	4.19	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	2	0	1	7	6	3.94	965/1255	3.94	4.53	4.33	4.37	3.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	913/1258	4.06	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	15	3	0	0	6	3	4	3.85	565/ 873	3.85	4.14	4.03	4.04	3.85

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A 3	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0	Major 8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 15			
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 13	Under-grad 31	Non-major 23
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: MLL 301 1
 Title Textual Analysis
 Instructor: Sloane,Robert A
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1027
 MAR 22, 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	0	7	8	5	3.76	1301/1509	3.76	4.42	4.31	4.32	3.76
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	7	4	3.52	1363/1509	3.52	4.39	4.26	4.25	3.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	5	6	8	4.00	924/1287	4.00	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	2	2	7	7	3.89	1095/1459	3.89	4.32	4.22	4.26	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	0	10	8	4.15	693/1406	4.15	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	10	5	3.85	978/1384	3.85	4.17	4.11	4.15	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	3	4	4	3	6	0	2.65	1453/1489	2.65	4.07	4.17	4.14	2.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	2	4	11	3	3.75	1469/1506	3.75	4.55	4.67	4.67	3.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	2	6	7	2	3.39	1300/1463	3.39	4.16	4.09	4.08	3.39
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	6	6	5	3.55	1364/1438	3.55	4.48	4.46	4.43	3.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	881/1421	4.75	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	3	10	4	3.65	1239/1411	3.65	4.39	4.31	4.29	3.65
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	7	7	3.85	1154/1405	3.85	4.45	4.32	4.32	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	1	2	16	4.60	211/1236	4.60	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	5	6	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	443/1255	4.67	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	235/ 873	4.45	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.45

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	18
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 3	Graduate	0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	Under-grad	21
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1		
			Other		0

Course-Section: MLL 305 1
 Title Intro Intercultural Co
 Instructor: McCray, Stanley
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1028
 MAR 22, 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	4	17	4.81	244/1509	4.81	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	201/1509	4.81	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	19	4.90	127/1287	4.90	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	11	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	346/1459	4.60	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	223/1406	4.67	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	15	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	531/1384	4.33	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	19	4.86	121/1489	4.86	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	3	4	13	1	3.57	1481/1506	3.57	4.55	4.67	4.67	3.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	5	11	4.47	367/1463	4.47	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	413/1438	4.78	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	588/1421	4.89	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	279/1411	4.78	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	321/1405	4.78	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	2	3	9	4.33	421/1236	4.33	3.92	4.00	4.07	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	244/1260	4.75	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	547/1255	4.55	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	212/1258	4.92	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	9	5	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	394/ 873	4.14	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.14
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: MLL 305 1
 Title Intro Intercultural Co
 Instructor: McCray, Stanley
 Enrollment: 55
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1028
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	19	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	10	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 328 1
 Title Chinese Fiction & Dram
 Instructor: Brown,William I
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1029
 MAR 22, 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	2	4	15	4.62	470/1509	4.62	4.42	4.31	4.32	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	5	14	4.48	589/1509	4.48	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	2	14	4.45	590/1287	4.45	4.48	4.30	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	3	13	4.30	715/1459	4.30	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	13	4.52	319/1406	4.52	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	4	12	4.19	677/1384	4.19	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	569/1489	4.43	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	12	8	4.24	1273/1506	4.24	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	381/1463	4.46	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	660/1438	4.62	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	863/1421	4.76	4.75	4.73	4.73	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	689/1411	4.45	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	4	14	4.50	634/1405	4.50	4.45	4.32	4.32	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	3	3	1	8	3.59	945/1236	3.59	3.92	4.00	4.07	3.59
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	272/1260	4.71	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.71
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	246/1255	4.86	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	386/1258	4.79	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.79
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	0	0	4	0	7	4.27	322/ 873	4.27	4.14	4.03	4.08	4.27
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.17	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.52	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.30	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.11	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.86	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.67	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.63	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.73	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	3.94	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.61	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.34	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.62	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.47	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.40	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	5.00	****

Course-Section: MLL 328 1
 Title Chinese Fiction & Dram
 Instructor: Brown, William I
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1029
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	7	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

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	1	1	2	6	4.30	833/1509	4.30	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1176/1509	3.89	4.39	4.26	4.26	3.89
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	779/1287	4.25	4.48	4.30	4.38	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	894/1459	4.13	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	4	4.00	813/1406	4.00	4.19	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	2	3	3.78	1036/1384	3.78	4.17	4.11	4.23	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	3	2	2	3.10	1398/1489	3.10	4.07	4.17	4.18	3.10
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	782/1506	4.80	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1006/1463	3.88	4.16	4.09	4.18	3.88
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1268/1438	3.90	4.48	4.46	4.50	3.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	3	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.39	4.31	4.35	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1132/1405	3.90	4.45	4.32	4.34	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	274/1236	4.50	3.92	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	621/1260	4.25	4.32	4.14	4.25	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	862/1255	4.13	4.53	4.33	4.46	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	535/1258	4.63	4.46	4.38	4.51	4.63
4. Were special techniques successful	1	7	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 873	****	4.14	4.03	4.26	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.62	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	8	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.75	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 603 1
 Title The Political Economy
 Instructor: Sinnegen, John
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1031
 MAR 22, 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	0	13	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	245/1509	4.77	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	11	0	3.85	1053/1287	3.85	4.48	4.30	4.22	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	9	0	3.75	1192/1459	3.75	4.32	4.22	4.16	3.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	3.92	909/1406	3.92	4.19	4.09	4.12	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	10	0	3.77	1043/1384	3.77	4.17	4.11	4.16	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	4	1	6	0	3.00	1403/1489	3.00	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.55	4.67	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	7	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.16	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	545/1438	4.77	4.48	4.46	4.49	4.77
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	5	0	1	1	5	3.08	1412/1421	3.08	4.75	4.73	4.78	3.08

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	7	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 605 1
 Title Field of Intercultural
 Instructor: Larkey,Ed
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1035
 MAR 22, 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	1	3	12	4.69	386/1509	4.69	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	3.63	1128/1287	3.63	4.48	4.30	4.22	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	10	0	3.56	1288/1459	3.56	4.32	4.22	4.16	3.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	5	10	0	3.50	1178/1406	3.50	4.19	4.09	4.12	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	3	9	0	3.40	1235/1384	3.40	4.17	4.11	4.16	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	0	2	4	6	0	3.33	1359/1489	3.33	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	13	0	3.93	1435/1506	3.93	4.55	4.67	4.71	3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	4	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	235/1463	4.63	4.16	4.09	4.15	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	960/1438	4.39	4.48	4.46	4.49	4.39
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	9	0	3	2	2	2.25	1418/1421	2.25	4.75	4.73	4.78	2.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 14	Graduate 8 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8 Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 0		

Course-Section: MLL 626 1
 Title Adv Methods in Intercu
 Instructor: Medina, Adriana
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 1039
 MAR 22, 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	5	4.83	218/1509	4.83	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	543/1509	4.50	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1287	****	4.48	4.30	4.22	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.16	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	3.83	986/1406	3.83	4.19	4.09	4.12	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	0	4	0	3.60	1263/1489	3.60	4.07	4.17	4.14	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	0	3.80	1465/1506	3.80	4.55	4.67	4.71	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1463	****	4.16	4.09	4.15	****

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	675/1438	4.90	4.48	4.46	4.49	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1084/1421	4.60	4.75	4.73	4.78	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 1	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 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			