

Course-Section: MLL 191 0101  
 Title THE WORLD OF LANGUAGE  
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY  
 Enrollment: 129  
 Questionnaires: 86

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1039  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	2	0	0	0	6	21	57	4.61	416/1504	4.61	4.51	4.27	4.13	4.61
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	9	71	4.78	200/1503	4.78	4.39	4.20	4.16	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	13	68	4.76	240/1290	4.76	4.52	4.28	4.19	4.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	48	0	1	2	6	26	4.63	310/1453	4.63	4.41	4.21	4.11	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	4	2	3	8	14	52	4.41	410/1421	4.41	4.39	4.00	3.91	4.41
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	54	1	0	3	4	22	4.53	274/1365	4.53	4.42	4.08	3.96	4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	0	6	7	70	4.77	180/1485	4.77	4.18	4.16	4.13	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	3	0	0	1	46	32	4.39	1179/1504	4.39	4.71	4.69	4.66	4.39
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	20	3	0	0	3	21	39	4.57	282/1483	4.57	4.23	4.06	3.97	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	1	16	65	4.73	456/1425	4.73	4.47	4.41	4.36	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	5	76	4.87	596/1426	4.87	4.83	4.69	4.56	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	5	12	64	4.73	303/1418	4.73	4.38	4.25	4.20	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	7	10	65	4.71	394/1416	4.71	4.31	4.26	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	12	2	4	7	20	36	4.22	527/1199	4.22	3.83	3.97	3.82	4.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	43	0	1	0	5	9	28	4.47	404/1312	4.47	4.25	4.00	3.69	4.47
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	43	0	0	3	7	6	27	4.33	746/1303	4.33	4.57	4.24	3.93	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	43	0	0	1	4	8	30	4.56	537/1299	4.56	4.57	4.25	3.94	4.56
4. Were special techniques successful	43	25	2	1	3	3	9	3.89	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	85	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	3.90	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	85	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.01	****
Field Work														
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	85	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	84	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	84	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	****	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	84	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	85	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.24	4.92	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	62	Required for Majors	35	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	14	2.00-2.99	7	C	1	General	16	Under-grad	86	Non-major	39
84-150	17	3.00-3.49	18	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			

P 0  
I 0  
? 3

Other

13

responses to be significant

Course-Section: MLL 218 0101  
 Title FILM & SOC IN LATIN AM  
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1040  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	725/1504	4.38	4.51	4.27	4.26	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1164/1503	3.85	4.39	4.20	4.18	3.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	9	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1290	****	4.52	4.28	4.27	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	594/1453	4.40	4.41	4.21	4.20	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	9	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1113/1421	3.50	4.39	4.00	3.90	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	217/1365	4.62	4.42	4.08	4.00	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	6	4.23	784/1485	4.23	4.18	4.16	4.15	4.23
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	10	2	4.17	1337/1504	4.17	4.71	4.69	4.68	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	989/1483	3.91	4.23	4.06	4.02	3.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	4	1	4	3.64	1284/1425	3.64	4.47	4.41	4.40	3.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	878/1426	4.73	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	984/1418	4.09	4.38	4.25	4.22	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	4	1	4	3.55	1235/1416	3.55	4.31	4.26	4.24	3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	195/1199	4.64	3.83	3.97	3.95	4.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	851/1312	3.85	4.25	4.00	3.98	3.85
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	177/1303	4.92	4.57	4.24	4.23	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	182/1299	4.92	4.57	4.25	4.21	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	2	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 758	****	4.00	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	14	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101  
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: RUSINKO, ELAINE (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1041  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	2	3	17	13	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	12	19	4.32	765/1503	4.32	4.39	4.20	4.22	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	5	10	21	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.52	4.28	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	14	19	4.41	594/1453	4.41	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	1	1	11	19	4.11	669/1421	4.11	4.39	4.00	4.01	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	4	10	17	4.06	754/1365	4.06	4.42	4.08	4.08	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	11	21	4.38	625/1485	4.38	4.18	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	19	16	4.46	1130/1504	4.46	4.71	4.69	4.65	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	2	1	0	6	16	10	4.03	832/1483	4.06	4.23	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	11	26	4.66	587/1425	4.50	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	3	6	27	4.67	967/1426	4.64	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	11	24	4.53	552/1418	4.43	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	2	11	23	4.39	761/1416	4.34	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	3	1	4	5	25	4.26	487/1199	4.26	3.83	3.97	4.02	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	3	3	7	10	3.69	932/1312	3.69	4.25	4.00	4.09	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	2	6	16	4.38	692/1303	4.38	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	4	3	18	4.46	613/1299	4.46	4.57	4.25	4.30	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	3	2	4	7	9	3.68	528/ 758	3.68	4.00	4.01	4.00	3.68

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 301 0101  
 Title TEXTUAL ANALYSIS  
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 55  
 Questionnaires: 40

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1042  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	2	3	17	13	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	5	12	19	4.32	765/1503	4.32	4.39	4.20	4.22	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	1	0	0	5	10	21	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.52	4.28	4.31	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	4	14	19	4.41	594/1453	4.41	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	1	1	11	19	4.11	669/1421	4.11	4.39	4.00	4.01	4.11
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	1	4	10	17	4.06	754/1365	4.06	4.42	4.08	4.08	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	3	11	21	4.38	625/1485	4.38	4.18	4.16	4.17	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	5	0	0	0	0	19	16	4.46	1130/1504	4.46	4.71	4.69	4.65	4.46
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	2	0	3	17	12	4.09	804/1483	4.06	4.23	4.06	4.08	4.06
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	8	0	0	1	4	10	17	4.34	961/1425	4.50	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	2	5	23	4.61	1036/1426	4.64	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	2	3	10	18	4.33	772/1418	4.43	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	8	0	2	1	1	10	18	4.28	845/1416	4.34	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.34
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	2	1	4	6	21	4.26	487/1199	4.26	3.83	3.97	4.02	4.26
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	3	3	3	7	10	3.69	932/1312	3.69	4.25	4.00	4.09	3.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	2	2	6	16	4.38	692/1303	4.38	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	4	3	18	4.46	613/1299	4.46	4.57	4.25	4.30	4.46
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	3	2	4	7	9	3.68	528/ 758	3.68	4.00	4.01	4.00	3.68

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	21	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	12	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	32				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 305 0101  
 Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO  
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY  
 Enrollment: 108  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1043  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	7	30	4.71	306/1504	4.71	4.51	4.27	4.27	4.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	31	4.82	164/1503	4.82	4.39	4.20	4.22	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	35	4.89	138/1290	4.89	4.52	4.28	4.31	4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	16	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	123/1453	4.86	4.41	4.21	4.23	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	7	25	4.63	235/1421	4.63	4.39	4.00	4.01	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	17	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.42	4.08	4.08	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	4	32	4.81	144/1485	4.81	4.18	4.16	4.17	4.81
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	15	20	4.53	1075/1504	4.53	4.71	4.69	4.65	4.53
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	3	1	1	2	8	18	4.37	506/1483	4.37	4.23	4.06	4.08	4.37
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	5	30	4.78	384/1425	4.78	4.47	4.41	4.43	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	34	4.97	151/1426	4.97	4.83	4.69	4.71	4.97
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	32	4.86	152/1418	4.86	4.38	4.25	4.26	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	6	29	4.72	366/1416	4.72	4.31	4.26	4.27	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	1	0	0	2	6	24	4.69	165/1199	4.69	3.83	3.97	4.02	4.69
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	5	4	14	4.39	474/1312	4.39	4.25	4.00	4.09	4.39
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	512/1303	4.59	4.57	4.24	4.27	4.59
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	425/1299	4.68	4.57	4.25	4.30	4.68
4. Were special techniques successful	17	11	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.00	4.01	4.00	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.09	4.12	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	1.00	4.09	4.20	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	****	4.40	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	****	4.23	4.29	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	****	4.09	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.84	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.24	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	3.98	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.25	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	****	4.43	4.52	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	****	4.23	4.13	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.65	4.77	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.29	4.14	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.44	4.47	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	****	4.53	4.74	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	****	4.49	4.36	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	5.00	4.60	4.63	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	****	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	37	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	****	4.51	3.95	****

Course-Section: MLL 305H  
 Title Intro Intercultural Communication  
 Instructor:  
 Enrollment: 0  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	****	4.90	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	****	4.91	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	****	4.92	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	****	4.87	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	****	4.79	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	****	4.75	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	990/1485	****	4.74	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1411/1504	****	4.73	4.69	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	****	4.33	4.06	3.97	4.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	****	4.93	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	****	4.99	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	****	4.91	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	****	4.95	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	****	4.88	3.97	3.82	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: MLL 305 0101  
 Title INTRO INTERCULTURAL CO  
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY  
 Enrollment: 108  
 Questionnaires: 38

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1043  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	22	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	10	Under-grad	38	Non-major	12
84-150	14	3.00-3.49	10	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	1						

Course-Section: MLL 470 0101  
 Title L2 ACQUISITION/LEARNIN  
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1044  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	1	4	5	4.18	972/1504	4.18	4.51	4.27	4.33	4.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	996/1503	4.09	4.39	4.20	4.18	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1193/1290	3.33	4.52	4.28	4.32	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	2	3	3.64	1241/1453	3.64	4.41	4.21	4.22	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	532/1421	4.27	4.39	4.00	4.02	4.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	2	6	4.18	654/1365	4.18	4.42	4.08	4.09	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	3	1	4	3.55	1268/1485	3.55	4.18	4.16	4.14	3.55
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	812/1504	4.82	4.71	4.69	4.73	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	4.23	4.06	4.11	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1129/1425	4.10	4.47	4.41	4.38	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	1197/1426	4.40	4.83	4.69	4.72	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	1	4	3.80	1141/1418	3.80	4.38	4.25	4.25	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1099/1416	3.90	4.31	4.26	4.26	3.90
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	2	1	5	0	3.11	1039/1199	3.11	3.83	3.97	4.05	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	877/1312	3.80	4.25	4.00	4.07	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	833/1303	4.20	4.57	4.24	4.34	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	768/1299	4.30	4.57	4.25	4.38	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	549/ 758	3.63	4.00	4.01	4.17	3.63

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 603 0101  
 Title POLI ECONOMY OF CULTUR  
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1045  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	396/1504	4.63	4.51	4.27	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	692/1503	4.38	4.39	4.20	4.28	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.52	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	705/1453	4.31	4.41	4.21	4.34	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.39	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	690/1365	4.14	4.42	4.08	4.35	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	5	4	3.60	1246/1485	3.60	4.18	4.16	4.24	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	850/1483	4.08	4.23	4.06	4.20	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	748/1425	4.57	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	572/1426	4.94	4.83	4.69	4.80	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1072/1418	4.04	4.38	4.25	4.36	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	9	4.44	714/1416	4.49	4.31	4.26	4.38	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	4	0	3	1	0	2.13	1178/1199	2.13	3.83	3.97	4.04	2.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.25	4.00	4.31	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	652/1303	4.43	4.57	4.24	4.58	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	792/1299	4.27	4.57	4.25	4.56	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	481/ 758	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.24	3.87
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	16

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

Course-Section: MLL 603 0101  
 Title POLI ECONOMY OF CULTUR  
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN (Instr. B)  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1046  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect					
	NR	NA	1	2						3	4	5	Mean	Rank
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	396/1504	4.63	4.51	4.27	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	7	4.38	692/1503	4.38	4.39	4.20	4.28	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.52	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	705/1453	4.31	4.41	4.21	4.34	4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	268/1421	4.57	4.39	4.00	4.27	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	690/1365	4.14	4.42	4.08	4.35	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	4	2	5	4	3.60	1246/1485	3.60	4.18	4.16	4.24	3.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	9	3	4.15	741/1483	4.08	4.23	4.06	4.20	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	3	11	4.60	665/1425	4.57	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1426	4.94	4.83	4.69	4.80	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	1	5	7	4.13	955/1418	4.04	4.38	4.25	4.36	4.04
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	593/1416	4.49	4.31	4.26	4.38	4.49
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	4	0	3	1	0	2.13	1178/1199	2.13	3.83	3.97	4.04	2.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	164/1312	4.80	4.25	4.00	4.31	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	652/1303	4.43	4.57	4.24	4.58	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	792/1299	4.27	4.57	4.25	4.56	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	481/ 758	3.87	4.00	4.01	4.24	3.87
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	5.00	4.34	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	9	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 2	Other	16

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

Course-Section: MLL 606 0101  
 Title THEOR HIST INTERCULT M  
 Instructor: SHEWBRIDGE, WIL  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1047  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1504	4.75	4.51	4.27	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1207/1503	3.75	4.39	4.20	4.28	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	507/1290	4.50	4.52	4.28	4.36	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.41	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	320/1421	4.50	4.39	4.00	4.27	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	139/1365	4.75	4.42	4.08	4.35	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.00	4.18	4.16	4.24	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.23	4.06	4.20	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.00	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1013/1418	4.00	4.38	4.25	4.36	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1295/1416	3.25	4.31	4.26	4.38	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.83	3.97	4.04	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1011/1312	3.50	4.25	4.00	4.31	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.57	4.24	4.58	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	570/1299	4.50	4.57	4.25	4.56	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	4.00	4.01	4.24	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: MLL 625 0101  
 Title INTER/CROSS-CULT COMMU  
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1048  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	2	15	4.68	337/1504	4.68	4.51	4.27	4.44	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	14	4.58	414/1503	4.58	4.39	4.20	4.28	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	180/1290	4.83	4.52	4.28	4.36	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	352/1453	4.59	4.41	4.21	4.34	4.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	14	4.63	229/1421	4.63	4.39	4.00	4.27	4.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	13	4.37	462/1365	4.37	4.42	4.08	4.35	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	2	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	329/1485	4.63	4.18	4.16	4.24	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	226/1483	4.65	4.23	4.06	4.20	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	456/1425	4.74	4.47	4.41	4.51	4.74
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	289/1418	4.74	4.38	4.25	4.36	4.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	15	4.68	420/1416	4.68	4.31	4.26	4.38	4.68
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	2	2	5	10	4.21	527/1199	4.21	3.83	3.97	4.04	4.21
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	176/1312	4.79	4.25	4.00	4.31	4.79
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	17	4.84	258/1303	4.84	4.57	4.24	4.58	4.84
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	213/1299	4.89	4.57	4.25	4.56	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	90/ 758	4.79	4.00	4.01	4.24	4.79
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.61	4.57	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	5.00	4.35	4.21	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	5.00	4.44	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.50	4.17	4.15	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	0	A	18	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	8	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	13	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: MLL 690 0101  
 Title SEM IN MOD LANG & LING  
 Instructor: LARKEY, EDWARD  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 1049  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.51	4.27	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.39	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.52	4.28	4.36	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.41	4.21	4.34	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.39	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.42	4.08	4.35	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.18	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.71	4.69	4.79	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.33	4.23	4.06	4.20	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.47	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.38	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.31	4.26	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	919/1199	3.50	3.83	3.97	4.04	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.25	4.00	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.57	4.24	4.58	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.57	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.00	4.01	4.24	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	239/ 244	1.00	1.00	4.09	4.09	1.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.61	4.57	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	5.00	4.35	4.21	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	5.00	4.34	4.48	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	5.00	4.44	4.39	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	31/ 73	4.50	4.50	4.17	4.15	4.50
Self Paced														
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.60	4.75	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

I 0  
? 0

Other

1