Baltimore County Fall 2009

Course-Section: ELC 401 1 University of Maryland Page 570 ELC41 MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Draganescu, Mari Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	36	
Questionnaires:	11	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title

Questions						NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			- 																
		General	=																
		w insights,skil				0	0	0	1	1	5			1051/1509		3.92	4.31	4.39	4.09
		tor make clear				0	0	1	2	2	2	4		1355/1509	3.90	3.87	4.26	4.26	3.55
		estions reflect				0	0	1	2	1	5	2		1178/1287	3.79	3.85	4.30	4.38	3.45
		ations reflect				0	0	2	1	3	2	3		1384/1459	3.70	3.91	4.22	4.32	3.27
		adings contribu				0	0	0	1	4	1	5		934/1406		3.84	4.09	4.11	3.91
		ignments contri		-	learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	2		1126/1384		3.76	4.11	4.23	3.64
		system clearly		ed		0	0	1	2	2	1	5		1249/1489	3.57	3.87	4.17	4.18	3.64
	-	was class cance				1	0	•	0	0	5			1070/1506		4.78	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How wor	ald you g	rade the overal	ll teachi	ng effect:	iveness	4	0	1	0	2	3	Τ	3.43	1284/1463	3.91	4.06	4.09	4.18	3.43
		Lecture	_	,		0	0	0	0	0	2		4 00	1004/1420	4 26	4 50	4 46	4 50	4 00
		ctor's lectures				2	0	0 2	0	2 2	3 2	4		1094/1438		4.58	4.46	4.50	4.22
		tor seem intere erial presented				1	0	2	1	1	1	4 5		1392/1421	4.23	4.60	4.73	4.76 4.35	3.60 3.60
		eriai presented s contribute to			early	1	1	1	1	1	3	3		1256/1411 1220/1405	4.11 3.98	4.32 4.14	4.31 4.32	4.35	3.60
					andina	0	0	3	2	1	2	-		1131/1236		3.87	4.00		3.00
5. Did aud	5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi						U	3	4		4	3	3.00	1131/1230	3.17	3.07	4.00	4.03	3.00
		Discuss	sion																
		ssions contribu		-		0	0	2	2	1	4	2		1136/1260		3.92	4.14	4.25	3.18
		ts actively end				0	0	1	2	2	3	3		1140/1255	3.64	3.93	4.33	4.46	3.45
		tor encourage i		open disc	ussion	0	0	2	2	2	2	3		1210/1258		4.34	4.38		3.18
4. Were sp	pecial te	chniques succes	ssful			0	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	691/ 873	3.86	4.24	4.03	4.26	3.55
		Laborat	cory																
2. Were yo	ou provid	ed with adequat	te backgro	ound info	rmation	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	3.67	4.12	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were ne	ecessary	materials avail	lable for	lab acti	vities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	4.50	3.48	4.48	4.66	****
					Frequ	uency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits Ea	Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad																			
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 1							Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	\$	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1		_						•	3					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2		Gei	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad I	1	Non-	major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0								-			,			,
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F P	0		E⊥€	ectiv	ves				1	#### - 1				_	11
	I O						O+1						2	respons	es to D	e sign	ıırıcan	I L	
				, T	1		Uti	ner					3						
				ſ	Т														

Course-Section: ELC 401 2 University of Maryland ELC41 Baltimore County

Title Instructor: Zhang, Zuotang

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 8

Page 571 MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ctudont	Courac	Evaluation	Onogtion	$n - i \times -$
Student	COULSE	Evaluation	Ouescion	патте

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	2	0	3	1	2	3.13	1467/1509	3.61	3.92	4.31	4.39	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	859/1509	3.90	3.87	4.26	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	869/1287	3.79	3.85	4.30	4.38	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	894/1459	3.70	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1045/1406	3.83	3.84	4.09	4.11	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	807/1384	3.82	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1303/1489	3.57	3.87	4.17	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	845/1506	4.63	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	467/1463	3.91	4.06	4.09	4.18	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	800/1438	4.36	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	665/1421	4.23	4.60	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	469/1411	4.11	4.32	4.73	4.75	4.63
	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.03	874/1405	3.98	4.14	4.31		4.03
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		1	1	0	3		2						4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	Τ	U	3	0	2	3.33	1056/1236	3.17	3.87	4.00	4.03	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	746/1260	3.59	3.92	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1023/1255	3.64	3.93	4.33	4.46	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1258	3.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	383/ 873	3.86	4.24	4.03	4.26	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	171/ 184	3.33	3.32	4.16	4.62	3.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	171/ 184	3.67	4.12	4.10	4.37	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	105/ 184	4.50	3.48	4.48	4.66	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	65/ 177	4.67	4.01	4.36	4.47	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.07	103/ 165	4.00	3.69	4.18	4.47	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	U	U	U	1	1	Τ	4.00	103/ 165	4.00	3.09	4.10	4.29	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	67/ 89	4.00	3.67	4.49	4.71	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.27	4.54	4.83	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	61/ 90	4.33	4.24	4.50	4.69	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 92	4.67	3.79	4.38	4.64	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	44/ 93	4.33	3.31	4.06	4.32	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	26/ 48	4.33	4.33	4.39	4.75	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	34/ 48	4.00	4.05	4.41	4.54	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	34/ 47	4.33	4.09	4.51	4.51	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	1	0	1	0	1		40/ 47	3.00	3.17	4.18	4.19	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	38/ 44	3.67	4.18	4.32	4.07	3.67
5. 214 conferences help you carry out richa activities	5	U	3	5	2	5	_	3.07	JU/ 11	3.07	1.10	1.52	1.0,	3.07
Self Paced	_				_	_								
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	28/ 49	4.00	3.74	4.26	4.67	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	1	1	1		18/ 41		3.95		4.50	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	31/ 46	4.00	3.60	4.31	4.67	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	21/ 37	4.33	2.95	4.05	4.67	4.33
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	15/ 30	4.33	3.93	4.27	4.33	4.33

Course-Section: ELC 401 2 Title ELC41

Instructor: Zhang, Zuotang

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2009

Page 571 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	Į
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 403 1 University of Maryland ELC43

Baltimore County Fall 2009 Title Instructor: Mundy,Susan E.

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 9

Page 572 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

C+11202+	Comman	Erroluntion	Ougation	2001200
Student.	COULSE	Evaluation	UUESLIOL	шатте

			Fre	eauer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	3	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1461/1509	4.14	3.92	4.31	4.39	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1489/1509	4.03	3.87	4.26	4.26	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1276/1287	3.86	3.85	4.30	4.38	2.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1447/1459	4.03	3.91	4.22	4.32	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	0	0	2.67	1381/1406	3.81	3.84	4.09	4.11	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1322/1384	3.75	3.76	4.11	4.23	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1303/1489	4.17	3.87	4.17	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1070/1506	4.67	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1463	4.80	4.06	4.09	4.18	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1203/1438	4.44	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1376/1421	4.56	4.60	4.73	4.76	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1187/1411	4.56	4.32	4.31	4.35	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1348/1405	4.17	4.14	4.32	4.34	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1207/1236	3.58	3.87	4.00	4.03	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1133/1260	4.32	3.92	4.14	4.25	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	1	1		1187/1255	4.23	3.93	4.33	4.46	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	932/1258	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	780/ 873	4.32	4.24	4.03	4.26	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3 00	****/ 184	****	3.32	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.12	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 184	****	3.48	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 177	****	4.01	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 165	***	3.69	4.18	4.29	***
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 89	****	3.67	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.27	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 90	****	4.24	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.79	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	3.31	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	4.05	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	4.09	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	1	1	0	0		****/ 47	****	3.17	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	2	0	0		****/ 44	****	4.18	4.32	4.07	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out freid decryferes	,	Ü	Ü	Ü	-	Ü	Ü	3.00	, 11		1.10	1.32	1.07	
Self Paced	_				_									
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	3.95	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	3.60	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	2.95	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.93	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: ELC 403 1
Title ELC43

Instructor: Mundy, Susan E.

Enrollment: 17
Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 572 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General		Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 403 2 University of Maryland Page 573 Title ELC43 MAR 22, 2010 Baltimore County

Instructor: Follett, Sonja (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

		Ouestions	3		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			, . – – – – –															
		General	_															
1. Did you	u gain new	w insights,skil	ls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	458/1509	4.14	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.63
2. Did the	e instruct	tor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1509	4.03	3.87	4.26	4.26	4.63
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	668/1287	3.86	3.85	4.30	4.38	4.38
4. Did oth	her evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1459	4.03	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.63
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	470/1406	3.81	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.38
6. Did wr	itten assi	ignments contri	.bute t	o what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	734/1384	3.75	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.13
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	z expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	458/1489	4.17	3.87	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How mar	ny times w	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	845/1506	4.67	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How wor	uld you gr	rade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.06	4.09	4.18	4.80
1. Were th	he instruc	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	262/1438	4.44	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.88		
2. Did the	e instruct	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.56	4.60	4.73	4.76	4.94		
				xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	169/1411	4.56	4.32	4.31	4.35	4.94
		s contribute to		-	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	634/1405	4.17	4.14	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enh	nance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	126/1236	3.58	3.87	4.00	4.03	4.75
		Discuss																
1. Did cla	ass discus	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	157/1260	4.32	3.92	4.14	4.25	4.88
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	344/1255	4.23	3.93	4.33	4.46	4.75
		_		d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	sful		0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	79/ 873	4.32	4.24	4.03	4.26	4.88
				Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	1									
Constitution D								D					m-				36-2	
credits Ea	ts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	sons	3 			Ту]	pe 			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	3	4	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0						_			-								
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General							1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0									_				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	ſh
	. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
										•	_		-					

Other

0

Ρ I

0

0

Course-Section: ELC 403 2 University of Maryland Page 574 Title ELC43 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor:

8 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 8 (Instr. B)

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

Queberonn	all CD	ŭ		beddelle coe	LLDC	Lvai	uucı	011 Q	acbc.			•						
							Fr	eque	ncie	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	- lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	458/1509	4.14	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.63
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1509	4.03	3.87	4.26	4.26	4.63
3. Did the	e exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	668/1287	3.86	3.85	4.30	4.38	4.38
4. Did ot	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1459	4.03	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.63
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	470/1406	3.81	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.38
6. Did wr	. Did written assignments contribute to what you lear					0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	734/1384	3.75	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.13
7. Was the	. Was the grading system clearly explained					0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	458/1489	4.17	3.87	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How man	8. How many times was class cancelled					0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	845/1506	4.67	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.75
1. Were tl	Lecture . Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	4.44	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.88
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject					0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421			4.73		4.94
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear:					0	0	0	0	0	_	5.00	1/1411					
		es contribute t			6 6	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1405				4.34	
				our understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/1236					
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	157/1260	4 32	3.92	4 14	4 25	4.88
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	344/1255			4.33		4.75
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258		4.34			
		echniques succe		a open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	79/ 873					
1	poorar o	Joinit Mach Pacce	55141		Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	•	1.00	,,, 0,5	1.52		1.05	1.20	1.00
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	ason	5			Ту	pe			Majors	}
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		 Re	quir	ed f	 or Ma			4	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55							-1411	- L	OI 1110	~] \- 1	-	-	Gradat	_	•	1100	-	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	8	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			u	_				_	011001 9		-	1.011		ŭ
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		E1	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enouc	rh.
	-	2.22 2.30	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
	I 0				Ot	her					0					-		
? 0												-						
				•														

Course-Section: ELC 43 1 University of Maryland Title ESL: Speaking and List Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Mundy,Susan E.

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 4

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 575

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies						Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	800/1509	4.04	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1509	4.17	3.87	4.26	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1287	4.25	3.85	4.30	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	686/1459	4.29	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	813/1406	3.88	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	807/1384	4.13	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	986/1489	4.13	3.87	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	853/1463	3.67	4.06	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1014/1421	4.83	4.60	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	416/1411	4.83	4.32	4.31	4.35	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	459/1405	4.58	4.14	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.71	3.87	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	Ω	Ο	Ο	2	1	4.33	558/1260	4.33	3.92	4.14	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	723/1255	4.67	3.93	4.33	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	932/1258	4.50	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	292/ 873	4.67	4.24	4.03	4.26	4.33

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

Course-Section: ELC 43 2 University of Maryland Title ESL: Speaking and List Baltimore County

Instructor: Follett,Sonja Enrollment: 4

Questionnaires: 4

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 576

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eanei	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	-	Mean	Mean
General	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2 75	1204/1500	1 01	2 02	1 21	4 20	2 75
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	Τ	1	0			1304/1509		3.92 3.87	4.31	4.39	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	-	0	0	Τ.	2	T		1086/1509	4.17	3.85	4.20	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2		4.50	519/1287	4.25			4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	4.25	770/1459	4.29	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	Τ	0	2	Τ		1045/1406	3.88	3.84	4.09	4.11	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	Τ	Τ	2	4.25	619/1384	4.13	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	760/1489	4.13	3.87	4.17	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	845/1506	4.88	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness		0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1314/1463	3.67	4.06	4.09	4.18	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	Λ	Ο	Λ	Λ	0	Λ	4	5.00	1/1438	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.60	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	4.83	4.32	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1405	4.58	4.14	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/1236		3.87	4.00		4.75
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	U	U	U	U	U	Т	3	4.75	120/1230	4./1	3.07	4.00	4.03	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	558/1260	4.33	3.92	4.14	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	4.67	3.93	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	4.50	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful		0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	4.67		4.03	4.26	5.00
	1	ŭ		Ū	3	,		2.00	=7 0.3	_,,,,			20	2.50
Frequ	iency	Dist	rib	utio	n									

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

Course-Section: ELC 501 1 University of Maryland ELC51

Page 577 Baltimore County Fall 2009 Title MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029 Instructor: Follett,Sonja

Enrollment:	24	_				
Questionnaires:	4		Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	303/1509	3.08	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1509	3.08	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	3.35	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	3.35	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1406	3.35	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1384	2.95	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	458/1489	2.90	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	3		1070/1506		4.78	4.67	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	545/1463	3.28	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438		4.58	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421		4.60	4.73	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	617/1411	3.33	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	345/1405	3.08	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1236	3.25	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	3.35	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258		4.34	4.38	4.50	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	3.88	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	37/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	83/ 198	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	77/ 184	2.53	3.48	4.48	4.11	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	110/ 177		4.01	4.36	4.41	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 165	3.33	3.69	4.18	4.25	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	51/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92		4.27	4.54	4.52	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90		4.24	4.50	4.48	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 92		3.79	4.38	4.30	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 93	2.53	3.31	4.06	4.04	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 48	4.07	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	30/ 48	4.07	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	26/ 47		4.09	4.51	4.43	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47		3.17	4.18	4.03	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.33
Self Paced		_												
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	25/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.33	13/ 41		3.95	4.14	4.08	4.33
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0 0	0	2 2	1 1	4.33	27/ 46		3.60	4.31	4.11	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1 1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	21/ 37 15/ 30	1.67		4.05 4.27	3.69 4.26	4.33
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	Т	U	U	U	U	4	Τ	4.33	15/ 30	3.41	3.93	4.4/	4.20	4.33

Course-Section: ELC 501 1
Title ELC51

Instructor: Follett, Sonja

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 577 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
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	Į
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	0	-			
				?	0						

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Title ELC51 Instructor: Mundy, Susan E. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 3

Page 578 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse	Evaluation	Questionnaire
-----------	-------	------------	---------------

			Fre	ימוופי	ncies	3		Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	0		1495/1509	3.08	3.92	4.31	4.39	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0		1496/1509	3.08	3.87	4.26	4.25	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0		1247/1287	3.35	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0		1422/1459	3.35	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0		1333/1406		3.84	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	0		1370/1384	2.95	3.76	4.11	4.16	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	0		1463/1489	2.90	3.87	4.17	4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506		4.78	4.67		5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	3.28	4.06	4.09	4.15	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1343/1438	4.21	4.58	4.46	4.49	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	1		1345/1421	4.38	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	_	4.50	,		4.32	4.31	4.33	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0		1265/1405		4.14	4.32	4.33	2.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50			3.87	4.00	3.98	2.75
or bid dudictibudi coomingach cimanoc four anacipounaing	_	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	_	ŭ	3.50	301, 1230	3.23	3.07	1.00	3.70	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0		1226/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1		1202/1255	3.35	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.88	4.34	4.38	4.50	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	650/ 873	3.88	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184		3.48	4.48	4.11	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	169/ 177		4.01	4.36	4.41	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165		3.69	4.18	4.25	3.00
Seminar	_			•		•	_		0.4./				4 00	
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92		4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90		4.24	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92		3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	90/ 93	2.53	3.31	4.06	4.04	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47	4.13	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	44/ 47	2.53	3.17	4.18	4.03	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.00
Ocle David														
Self Paced	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	16/ 10	2 27	2 74	1 20	1 10	2 00
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	46/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2 2	0	0	0	0 1	1	0	4.00	18/ 41		3.95	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful		0	0	0		0	0	3.00	40/ 46		3.60	4.31	4.11	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0 1	0	0	1.00	34/ 37		2.95	4.05	3.69	1.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	U	U	U	Т	U	U	3.00	26/ 30	3.27	3.93	4.27	4.26	3.00

Course-Section: ELC 501 2 University of Maryland Page 578
Title ELC51 Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Mundy,Susan E. (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 8

Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Fall 2009

Job IRBR3029

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

Course-Section: ELC 501 2 Title

University of Maryland

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

ELC51 Baltimore County Instructor:

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 3

(Instr. B) Fall 2009

Page 579 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fr 1	eque:	ncies 3	3	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1495/1509	3.08	3.92	4.31	4.39	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1496/1509	3.08	3.87	4.26	4.25	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.35	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.35	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.35	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1370/1384	2.95	3.76	4.11	4.16	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1463/1489	2.90	3.87	4.17	4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.90	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1405/1405	3.08	4.14	4.32	4.33	2.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1219/1236	3.25	3.87	4.00	3.98	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1226/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1202/1255	3.35	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.88	4.34	4.38	4.50	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	650/ 873	3.88	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.48	4.48	4.11	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	169/ 177	3.27	4.01	4.36	4.41	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165	3.33	3.69	4.18	4.25	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.13	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90	4.13	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92	3.33	3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	90/ 93	2.53	3.31	4.06	4.04	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47	4.13	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	44/ 47	2.53	3.17	4.18	4.03	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	46/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 41	4.07	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 46	3.27	3.60	4.31	4.11	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	34/ 37	1.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	1.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 30	3.27	3.93	4.27	4.26	3.00

Course-Section: ELC 501 2

Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Title ELC51
Instructor: (Instr

Instructor: (Instr. B)
Enrollment: 8

Page 579 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ELC 501 2 Title ELC51

University of Maryland

Baltimore County Fall 2009

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 3

Instructor:

(Instr. C)

Page 580 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect		
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	1	0		1495/1509		3.92	4.31		2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0		1496/1509	3.08	3.87	4.26	4.25	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1 1	1	0		1247/1287	3.35		4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	T	1 1	0		1422/1459 1333/1406	3.35	3.91	4.22	4.16 4.12	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1 1	0	0	1	1	0	0		1370/1384					2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	0		1463/1489	2.95 2.90	3.76 3.87		4.16 4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.90				5.00
o. now many times was class cancelled		U	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	1/1500	4.90	4.70	4.07	4./1	5.00
Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1411/1411	3.33	4.32	4.31	4.33	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0		1226/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1		1202/1255	3.35	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	1		1102/1258	3.88		4.38	4.50	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	650/ 873	3.88	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184		3.48	4.48	4.11	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	169/ 177		4.01	4.36	4.41	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165			4.18		3.00
or word requirements for run reports orearry specifical	_	Ü	Ū	Ü	_	Ü	Ū	3.00	133, 133	3.33	3.03	1110	1.25	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.13	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90	4.13	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92	3.33	3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	90/ 93	2.53	3.31	4.06	4.04	2.00
Field Work	_	0	0	•	0	-	0	4 00	24/ 40	4 0 17	4 22	4 20	1 26	4 00
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47	4.13	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	44/ 47	2.53	3.17	4.18	4.03	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	46/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 41	4.07	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 46	3.27	3.60	4.31	4.11	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	34/ 37	1.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	1.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 30	3.27	3.93	4.27	4.26	3.00
	_	-	-	-	-	-	-		., 30					

Course-Section: ELC 501 2

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Title ELC51

Instructor: 8 Fall 2009

Page 580 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ELC 501 2

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Title ELC51 Instructor: (Instr. D)

8 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 3 Fall 2009

Page 581 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

		Frequencies						Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	1	0	2 67	1495/1509	3.08	3.92	4.31	4.39	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0		1496/1509		3.87	4.26	4.25	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0		1247/1287		3.85	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0		1422/1459		3.91	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0		1333/1406		3.84	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	0		1370/1384		3.76	4.11	4.16	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1463/1489	2.90	3.87	4.17	4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.90	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1462/1463	3.28	4.06	4.09	4.15	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1226/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1		1202/1255		3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	1		1102/1258		4.34	4.38	4.50	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67			4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198		4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00			3.48	4.48	4.11	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	169/ 177		4.01	4.36	4.41	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00			3.69	4.18	4.25	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92		4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90		4.24	4.54	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92		3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	90/ 93			4.06		2.00
	_	ŭ	ŭ	_	Ü	ŭ	Ū	2.00	30, 33	2.55	3.31		1.01	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48		4.33	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48		4.05	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47		4.09	4.51	4.43	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	44/ 47		3.17	4.18	4.03	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	46/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 41	4.07	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 46		3.60	4.31	4.11	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	34/ 37	1.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	1.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 30	3.27	3.93	4.27	4.26	3.00
Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	outio	n									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected (Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A (0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В (0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C (0	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D (0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F (0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

I

Course-Section: ELC 503 1 University of Maryland ELC53

Title Baltimore County Instructor: Edmonds, Lori M Fall 2009

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Page 582

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	800/1509	4.33	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	543/1509	4.50	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	472/1287	4.56	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	686/1459	4.33	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	753/1406	4.08	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1050/1384	3.75	3.76	4.11	4.16	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	674/1489	4.33	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1438	4.64	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1099/1421	4.58	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	677/1411	4.45	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	745/1405	4.42	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	392/1236	4.36	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	558/1260	4.33	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	828/1255	4.18	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	710/1258	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	37/ 184	4.67	3.32	4.16	4.07	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 198	4.67	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	77/ 184	4.67	3.48	4.48	4.11	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	65/ 177	4.67	4.01	4.36	4.41	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 165	4.67	3.69	4.18	4.25	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	51/ 89	4.67	3.67	4.49	4.39	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 92	4.67	3.79	4.38	4.30	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 93	4.67	3.31	4.06	4.04	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/ 48	4.67	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 48	4.67	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	26/ 47	4.67	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	2		20/ 47	4.67	3.17	4.18	4.03	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 44	4.67	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 49	4.67	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	10/ 41	4.67	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/ 46	4.67	3.60	4.31	4.11	4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	17/ 37	4.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	4.67
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	13/ 30	4.67	3.93	4.27	4.26	4.67

Course-Section: ELC 503 1
Title ELC53

Edmonds,Lori M

Instructor: Edmo Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 582 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 504 1 University of Maryland ELC54

Title Baltimore County Instructor: Vinogradova, Pol Fall 2009

Enrollment: 15 Ouestionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 583

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 2 6 3 4.09 1051/1509 4.27 3.92 4.31 4.39 4.09 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 742/1509 4.47 3.87 4.26 4.25 4.36 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 4 0 1 2 3 1 3.57 1144/1287 3.79 3.85 4.30 4.22 3.57 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 7 3 4.18 843/1459 4.36 3.91 4.22 4.16 4.18 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 00 3 6 2 3.91 934/1406 4.08 3.84 4.09 4.12 3.91 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 5 3 4.00 807/1384 4.08 3.76 4.11 4.16 4.00 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 2 5 4 4.18 833/1489 4.22 3.87 4.17 4.14 4.18 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.64 965/1506 4.65 4.78 4.67 4.71 4.64 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 1 6 1 4.00 853/1463 4.50 4.06 4.09 4.15 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 1 1 2 7 4.36 970/1438 4.56 4.58 4.46 4.49 4.36 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 1189/1421 4.64 4.60 4.73 4.78 4.45 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 779/1411 4.47 4.32 4.31 4.33 4.36 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 4.36 798/1405 4.52 4.14 4.32 4.33 4.36 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 1 0 1 7 2 3.82 819/1236 4.06 3.87 4.00 3.98 3.82 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 7 4.45 460/1260 4.35 3.92 4.14 4.21 4.45 4 4 4.09 877/1255 4.17 3.93 4.33 4.43 4.09 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 3 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 591/1258 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.50 4.55 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 2 3 6 4.36 279/873 4.35 4.24 4.03 4.01 4.36 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 1 3.78 145/ 184 3.78 3.32 4.16 4.07 3.78 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 2 0 1 0 2 5 1 3.56 180/ 198 3.56 4.12 4.22 4.31 3.56 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 2 0 0 0 1 5 3 4.22 146/184 4.22 3.48 4.48 4.11 4.22 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 2 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.44 91/177 4.44 4.01 4.36 4.41 4.44 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 2 0 0 1 1 3 4 4.11 97/165 4.11 3.69 4.18 4.25 4.11 Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 3.88 75/ 89 3.88 3.67 4.49 4.39 3.88 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 2 0 0 0 1 5 3 4.22 69/ 92 4.22 4.27 4.54 4.52 4.22 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 2 0 5 3 4.22 0 0 1 63/ 90 4.22 4.24 4.50 4.48 4.22 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 2 4 3 4.11 66/ 92 4.11 3.79 4.38 4.30 4.11 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 2 0 0 1 1 5 2 3.89 63/ 93 3.89 3.31 4.06 4.04 3.89 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 5 3 4.22 32/ 48 4.22 4.33 4.39 4.36 4.22 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 2 0 0 1 2 4 2 3.78 42/ 48 3.78 4.05 4.41 4.40 3.78 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 2 1 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 23/ 47 4.75 4.09 4.51 4.43 4.75 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 2 0 0 0 3 4 2 3.89 35/ 47 3.89 3.17 4.18 4.03 3.89 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 2 1 0 0 0 5 3 4.38 23/ 44 4.38 4.18 4.32 4.45 4.38 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 3 4 2 3.89 39/ 49 3.89 3.74 4.26 4.16 3.89 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2 1 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 35/ 41 3.75 3.95 4.14 4.08 3.75 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 2 1 0 0 1 4 3 4.25 28/ 46 4.25 3.60 4.31 4.11 4.25 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 2 1 0 0 1 3 4 4.38 20/ 37 4.38 2.95 4.05 3.69 4.38 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 2 1 0 0 2 4 2 4.00 16/ 30 4.00 3.93 4.27 4.26 4.00 Course-Section: ELC 504 1
Title ELC54

ELC54

Instructor: Vinog Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

Vinogradova,Pol

Fall 2009

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 583 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Frequency Distribution

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

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

Course-Section: ELC 504 2 University of Maryland Title ELC54 Instructor:

Baltimore County Palmer,Tsisana Fall 2009

Enrollment: 17 Ouestionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Page 584

MAR 22, 2010

Job IRBR3029

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 1 0 0 0 2 2 7 4.45 661/1509 4.27 3.92 4.31 4.39 4.45 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 1 9 4.58 447/1509 4.47 3.87 4.26 4.25 4.58 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 3 1 0 1 3 4 4.00 924/1287 3.79 3.85 4.30 4.22 4.00 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 410/1459 4.36 3.91 4.22 4.16 4.55 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 4 1 7 4.25 587/1406 4.08 3.84 4.09 4.12 4.25 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 701/1384 4.08 3.76 4.11 4.16 4.17 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 4 1 7 4.25 760/1489 4.22 3.87 4.17 4.14 4.25 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 1 0 0 0 11 4.67 941/1506 4.65 4.78 4.67 4.71 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 800045.00 1/1463 4.50 4.06 4.09 4.15 5.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 447/1438 4.56 4.58 4.46 4.49 4.75 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 1 0 11 4.83 716/1421 4.64 4.60 4.73 4.78 4.83 0 2 1 9 4.58 520/1411 4.47 4.32 4.31 4.33 4.58 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.67 459/1405 4.52 4.14 4.32 4.33 4.67 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 1 0 1 1 7 4.30 451/1236 4.06 3.87 4.00 3.98 4.30 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 7 4.25 621/1260 4.35 3.92 4.14 4.21 4.25 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 3 0 8 4.25 783/1255 4.17 3.93 4.33 4.43 4.25 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 1 1 1 9 4.50 620/1258 4.52 4.34 4.38 4.50 4.504. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 2 4 6 4.33 292/ 873 4.35 4.24 4.03 4.01 4.33 Laboratory 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 184 3.78 3.32 4.16 4.07 **** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 10 0 0 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 10 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 198 3.56 4.12 4.22 4.31 **** 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 10 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 184 4.22 3.48 4.48 4.11 **** 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance 10 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 177 4.44 4.01 4.36 4.41 **** 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 10 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 165 4.11 3.69 4.18 4.25 **** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2 5.00 ****/ 89 3.88 3.67 4.49 4.39 **** 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 10 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 ****/ 92 4.22 4.27 4.54 4.52 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 ****/ 90 4.22 4.24 4.50 4.48 **** 0 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 92 4.11 3.79 4.38 4.30 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 93 3.89 3.31 4.06 4.04 **** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 4.22 4.33 4.39 4.36 **** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 48 3.78 4.05 4.41 4.40 **** 3. Was the instructor available for consultation 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 4.75 4.09 4.51 4.43 **** 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations 11 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 47 3.89 3.17 4.18 4.03 **** 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 44 4.38 4.18 4.32 4.45 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 49 3.89 3.74 4.26 4.16 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 1100 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 41 3.75 3.95 4.14 4.08 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 46 4.25 3.60 4.31 4.11 ****

4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 37 4.38 2.95 4.05 3.69 ****

5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 30 4.00 3.93 4.27 4.26 ****

Course-Section: ELC 504 2

Title ELC54
Instructor: Palmer,Tsisana

Enrollment: 17

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 584 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ELC 51 1

ESL: Adv Writing and G

Title Instructor: Follett,Sonja

Enrollment:

8 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 585 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies			Inct	ructor	Course	Dent	UMBC	Lezzel	Sect		
Questions	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	1	7	4.88	184/1509	4.27	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509	4.46	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	261/1287	4.46	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	454/1459	4.08	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1406	4.43	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	421/1384	4.13	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	224/1489	4.36	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	722/1506	4.82	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	325/1463	4.42	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	646/1438	4.71	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1107/1421	4.49	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	169/1411	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	205/1405	4.64	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	383/1236	4.06	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	621/1260	4.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	690/1255	4.19	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.81	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	274/ 873	4.52	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 184	4.75	3.32	4.16	4.07	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.12	4.22	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	53/ 184	4.75	3.48	4.48	4.11	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.01	4.36	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	52/ 165	4.50	3.69	4.18	4.25	4.50
Seminar						_								
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	59/ 89	4.50	3.67	4.49	4.39	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	58/ 92	4.50	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2		4.50	54/ 90	4.50		4.50	4.48	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1		4.75	25/ 92	4.75	3.79	4.38	4.30	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	33/ 93	4.50	3.31	4.06	4.04	4.50
7' 11 m 1														
Field Work		0	0	_	0	-	_	4 85	10/ 10	4 85	4 22	4 20	4 26	4 85
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	19/ 48	4.75	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	17/ 48	4.75	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	28/ 47	4.50	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	24/ 47	4.50	3.17	4.18	4.03	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	13/ 44	4.75	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.75
Calf Darad														
Self Paced	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4 50	22/ 42	4 50	2 74	1 00	1 10	4 50
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	22/ 49	4.50	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	9/ 41	4.75	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.75
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	3		20/ 46		3.60		4.11	4.75
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1 0	_	4.75	16/ 37	4.75	2.95	4.05	3.69	4.75
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	U	0	0	U	U	4	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	3.93	4.2/	4.26	5.00

Course-Section: ELC 51 1 Title

ESL: Adv Writing and G

Instructor: Follett,Sonja

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 8 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 585 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: ELC 51 2

University of Maryland ESL: Adv Writing and G

Title Instructor: Mundy,Susan E.

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 7 Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 586 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anier	ncies	3		Tnsi	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	1	2	2		1340/1509	4.27	3.92	4.31	4.39	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	952/1509	4.46	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	844/1287	4.46	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1238/1459	4.08	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	813/1406	4.43	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	993/1384	4.13	3.76	4.11	4.16	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	986/1489	4.36	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	782/1506	4.82	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.42	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1438	4.71	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	3		1217/1421	4.49	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2								
	2	0	0	0	0	3		4.60	496/1411		4.32	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned									758/1405			4.32	4.33	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	853/1236	4.06	3.87	4.00	3.98	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	936/1260	4.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	904/1255	4.19	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258	4.81	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	4.52	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.67
Laboratory														
Laboratory	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 10/	4 75	2 22	1 10	4 07	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material		-	-	0	0	1	0		****/ 184		3.32	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0		-	0	1		****/ 198	5.00	4.12	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 184		3.48	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 177		4.01	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	4.50	3.69	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	4.50	3.67	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	4.50	4.27	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	4.50	4.24	4.50	4.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 48	4.75	4.33	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, -	4.75				****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 47	4.75	4.05 4.09	4.41 4.51	4.40	****
	6	0		0	0	1	0							****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations		0	0		-	_	0		,	4.50	3.17	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	Ü	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	4.75	4.18	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	4.50	3.74	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	4.75	3.95	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	4.75	3.60	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	4.75	2.95	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	5.00	3.93	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: ELC 51 2

Title ESL: Adv Writing and G

Instructor: Mundy,Susan E.

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 7

Adv Writing and G Baltimore County 7,Susan E. Fall 2009

Page 586 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 53 1 University of Maryland Page 587 Title ESL: ADV SPEAK & LISTE Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009

Instructor: Edmonds,Lori M Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Job IRBR3029

			Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	4.33	800/1509	4.33	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1287	4.00	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	686/1459	4.33	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.67	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.67
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 ا	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1384	4.67	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.67	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.67
3. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.32	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.87	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1255	4.50	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.01	5.00
Fred	uency	Dis Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades	;			Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3

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

Course-Section: ELC 54 1

ESL: X-Cultural Commun

Title Vinogradova,Pol

Instructor: Enrollment:

1 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009

Page 588 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	arnar	ncies			Tng	tructor	Course	Dent	TIMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	3.92	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1463/1509	3.00	3.87	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.00	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.00	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.87	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.60	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1131/1236	3.00	3.87	4.00	3.98	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		1202/1255	3.00	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.00
T albania bianna														
Laboratory	0	0	0	^	^	1	^	4 00	106/104	4 00	2 20	1 10	4 07	4 00
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	3.32	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	161/ 184	4.00	3.48	4.48	4.11	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.01	4.36	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165	3.00	3.69	4.18	4.25	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.00	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.00	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.00	69/ 90	4.00		4.54	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0		3.00	87/ 92	3.00	3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	79/ 93	3.00	3.79	4.06	4.04	3.00
5. Were Criteria for grading made crear	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	U	3.00	19/ 93	3.00	3.31	4.00	4.04	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.36	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	1	0	0		47/ 48	3.00	4.05	4.41	4.40	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	47/ 47	2.00	4.09	4.51	4.43	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 47	3.00	3.17	4.18	4.03	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.00		4.32	4.45	4.00
J. Dia conferences help you early out fretu activities	U	J	J	J	J	_	U	1.00	50/ 44	1.00	1.10	1.24	1.13	1.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 49	4.00	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	41/ 41	2.00	3.95	4.14	4.08	2.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	1	0	0	0		46/ 46			4.31	4.11	2.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 37	3.00	2.95	4.05	3.69	3.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	3.93		4.26	5.00
1 Short should product for all the beautiful	0	J	3	,	3	,	_	2.00	2, 30	3.00	3.73		1.20	3.00

Course-Section: ELC 54 1

Title ESL: X-Cultural Commun

Instructor: Vinogradova, Pol

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2009 Page 588 MAR 22, 2010 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

University of Maryland ELC61 Baltimore County Mundy, Susan E. Fall 2009

Enrollment:

Grad.

2

3.50-4.00

0

8

Questions

Course-Section: ELC 601 1 Page 589 Title MAR 22, 2010 Instructor: Job IRBR3029

Frequencies

NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean

Instructor

Rank

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

Mean Mean Mean Mean

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Ouestionnaires:	5	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire
Questionnaires.	3	Deddelle	COULDC	n varaatron	Queberonnarie

F

Ρ

Ι

0

0

0

1

	,	Genera	_		_	•	_	_	•	_	_		4.05/4.55			4 0.5	4 0.5	
		w insights,ski			2	0	1	0	0	1	1		1435/1509		3.92		4.39	3.33
		tor make clear			2	0	1	0	0	1	1		1419/1509	3.33	3.87	4.26	4.25	3.33
	_	estions reflec		_	2	0	Ι	0	0	Ι	1		1204/1287	3.33	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.33
		ations reflect			2	0	0	0	2	0	1		1238/1459	3.67			4.16	3.67
	_	-		what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	1		1258/1406	3.33	3.84		4.12	3.33
		_		to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	1		1264/1384	3.33		4.11	4.16	3.33
		system clearly		ained	2	0	1	1	0	0	1		1450/1489	2.67	3.87	4.17	4.14	2.67
	-	was class cance			2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	,	5.00	4.78	4.67		5.00
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1314/1463	3.33	4.06	4.09	4.15	3.33
		Lectur	<u> </u>															
1 Were tl	he instru	ctor's lecture		prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4 33	1001/1438	4.33	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.33
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	0	0	1	2		1014/1421	4.67		4.73	4.78	4.67
				explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	0			1235/1411	3.67		4.31	4.33	3.67
		s contribute to		-	2	0	1	0	0	1			1306/1405	3.33	4.14			3.33
				your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	1			,		3.87			
J. Dia aa	alovibaai	. ccciniiques cii	ilalice j	our understanding		O	_	O	O	_	_	3.33	1030/1230	3.33	3.07	1.00	3.70	3.33
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	3.00
2. Were a	ll studen	ts actively en	courage	ed to participate	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the	e instruc	tor encourage :	fair ar	nd open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1184/1258	3.33	4.34	4.38	4.50	3.33
4. Were s	pecial te	chniques succe	ssful	_	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	650/ 873	3.67	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67
				_														
				Freque	ency	Dist	cribi	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Тур	e			Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	3	Graduate	!	2	Majo	r	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0													_	_				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 0	C 0		Gei	nera:	1				0	Under-gr	ad	3	Non-	major	5
84-150	D 0																	

Electives

Other

0

0

Course-Section: ELC 603 1 University of Maryland Title Speaking & Listening L Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010

Instructor: Follett,Sonja

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 1

Fall 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 590

Job IRBR3029

					Fr	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 .1															
1. Did y	you gain n	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	3.92	4.31	4.39	5.00
_		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	3.87	4.26	4.25	5.00
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1287	5.00	3.85	4.30	4.22	5.00
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	3.91	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did a	assigned r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	3.84	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did w	written as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.76	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was t	the gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.87	4.17	4.14	5.00
		was class cand			0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
				ching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.06	4.09	4.15	5.00
	Lecture																	
1. Were	. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did t	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.60	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was 1	lecture ma	terial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.32	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did t	the lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.14	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did a	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.87	4.00	3.98	5.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were	all stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	3.93	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did t	the instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were	special t	echniques succe	essful	_	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.01	5.00
	Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n												
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
										- - – –								
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	е	1	Majo	or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0					_		-					1		•			_	
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad	0	Non-	-major	1

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

Course-Section: ELC 61 1 University of Maryland Page 591 Title ESL TOP I: ACAD DISCOU Baltimore County MAR 22, 2010 Fall 2009 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Mundy, Susan E.

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	quer	ncies	3		Instr	uctor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

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