

Course-Section: ELC 41 02
 Title ESL: Writing and Gramm
 Instructor: Zhang,Zuotang
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 564
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	2	3	3	2	1	2.73	1435/1447	2.73	3.91	4.31	4.43	2.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	4	2	1	2.82	1416/1447	2.82	4.10	4.27	4.31	2.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	2	3	3	3.50	1143/1241	3.50	4.11	4.33	4.41	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	2	2	3.20	1343/1402	3.20	4.07	4.24	4.34	3.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	1	1	2	2	3.13	1278/1358	3.13	3.87	4.11	4.15	3.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	1212/1316	3.30	3.86	4.14	4.27	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	1	3	1	3	3.20	1341/1427	3.20	4.09	4.19	4.20	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	1414/1447	3.80	4.48	4.69	4.72	3.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	1	1	3	1	0	2.67	1395/1434	2.67	3.88	4.10	4.17	2.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	3	0	3	3.11	1344/1387	3.11	4.39	4.46	4.48	3.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	3	2	0	3	2.90	1384/1387	2.90	4.34	4.73	4.76	2.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	2	2	0	3	3.00	1328/1386	3.00	4.33	4.32	4.34	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	2	0	4	0	2	3.00	1317/1380	3.00	4.19	4.32	4.34	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	2	2	1	1	2.44	1162/1193	2.44	3.88	4.02	4.00	2.44
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	0	2	2.90	1119/1172	2.90	4.08	4.15	4.25	2.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	1	3	0	2	2.50	1173/1182	2.50	3.89	4.35	4.49	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	3	0	4	1	2	2.90	1142/1170	2.90	4.15	4.38	4.51	2.90
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	3	2	1	1	2	2.67	777/ 800	2.67	4.03	4.06	4.19	2.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 1	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 10	Non-major 11
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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 2			

Course-Section: ELC 42 02
 Title ESL: Reading and Vocab
 Instructor: Zhang,Zuotang
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 565
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	3.25	1381/1447	3.25	3.91	4.31	4.43	3.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	532/1447	4.50	4.10	4.27	4.31	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1068/1241	3.75	4.11	4.33	4.41	3.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.07	4.24	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1231/1358	3.33	3.87	4.11	4.15	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1050/1316	3.67	3.86	4.14	4.27	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1312/1427	3.33	4.09	4.19	4.20	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	958/1447	4.67	4.48	4.69	4.72	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1349/1434	3.00	3.88	4.10	4.17	3.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	798/1387	4.50	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1143/1387	4.50	4.34	4.73	4.76	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.34	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	659/1380	4.50	4.19	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1022/1193	3.33	3.88	4.02	4.00	3.33

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	580/1172	4.25	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	1078/1182	3.50	3.89	4.35	4.49	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.15	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.03	4.06	4.19	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	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 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 responses to be significant	
				P 0				
				I 0	Other	1		
				? 0				

Course-Section: ELC 43 01
 Title ESL: Speaking and List
 Instructor: Janjigian, Kenne
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 566
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	3.92	1148/1447	3.92	3.91	4.31	4.43	3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	662/1447	4.42	4.10	4.27	4.31	4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	646/1241	4.42	4.11	4.33	4.41	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	766/1402	4.25	4.07	4.24	4.34	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	756/1358	4.08	3.87	4.11	4.15	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	763/1316	4.09	3.86	4.14	4.27	4.09
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	582/1427	4.42	4.09	4.19	4.20	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	727/1447	4.82	4.48	4.69	4.72	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	849/1434	4.00	3.88	4.10	4.17	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	429/1387	4.75	4.39	4.46	4.48	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	859/1387	4.75	4.34	4.73	4.76	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	431/1386	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.34	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	749/1380	4.42	4.19	4.32	4.34	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	262/1193	4.55	3.88	4.02	4.00	4.55
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.08	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	856/1182	4.00	3.89	4.35	4.49	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	532/1170	4.58	4.15	4.38	4.51	4.58
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	380/ 800	4.17	4.03	4.06	4.19	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 5	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 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ELC 51 01
 Title ESL: Adv Writing and G
 Instructor: Follett, Sonja
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 567
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	518/1447	4.78	3.91	4.31	4.46	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	137/1447	4.90	4.10	4.27	4.30	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	6	4.19	833/1241	4.56	4.11	4.33	4.38	4.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	645/1402	4.52	4.07	4.24	4.29	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	419/1358	4.62	3.87	4.11	4.26	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	465/1316	4.59	3.86	4.14	4.34	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	265/1427	4.81	4.09	4.19	4.25	4.69
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	5	9	4.38	1175/1447	4.69	4.48	4.69	4.74	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	70/1434	4.96	3.88	4.10	4.21	4.92
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	626/1387	4.81	4.39	4.46	4.51	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	958/1387	4.84	4.34	4.73	4.81	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	171/1386	4.94	4.33	4.32	4.43	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	520/1380	4.77	4.19	4.32	4.38	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	3	0	6	4	3.47	975/1193	4.03	3.88	4.02	4.02	3.47
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	377/1172	4.68	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	621/1182	4.64	3.89	4.35	4.46	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	538/1170	4.75	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	195/ 800	4.68	4.03	4.06	4.10	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.67	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 168	****	****	4.20	4.55	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	****	4.58	4.71	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 2	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 4	Under-grad 14	Non-major 16
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0			
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ELC 51 02
 Title ESL: Adv Writing and G
 Instructor: Janjigian, Kenne
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 568
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1447	4.78	3.91	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	78/1447	4.90	4.10	4.27	4.30	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	99/1241	4.56	4.11	4.33	4.38	4.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	10	4.67	314/1402	4.52	4.07	4.24	4.29	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	137/1358	4.62	3.87	4.11	4.26	4.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	181/1316	4.59	3.86	4.14	4.34	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	60/1427	4.81	4.09	4.19	4.25	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1447	4.69	4.48	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1434	4.96	3.88	4.10	4.21	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	4.81	4.39	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1387	4.84	4.34	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1386	4.94	4.33	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1380	4.77	4.19	4.32	4.38	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	236/1193	4.03	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.58
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	152/1172	4.68	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	250/1182	4.64	3.89	4.35	4.46	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	178/1170	4.75	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.93
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	84/ 800	4.68	4.03	4.06	4.10	4.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 189	****	****	4.34	4.82	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 192	****	****	4.34	4.79	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.73	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	****	4.33	4.67	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	14	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 53 01
 Title ESL: ADV SPEAK & LISTE
 Instructor: Welch, Christoph
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 569
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	5	2	1	0	2.50	1440/1447	3.08	3.91	4.31	4.46	2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	2.00	1444/1447	3.00	4.10	4.27	4.30	2.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	0	2	1	0	1.88	1240/1241	3.10	4.11	4.33	4.38	1.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	2.25	1397/1402	3.29	4.07	4.24	4.29	2.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	2	1	0	2.13	1349/1358	2.90	3.87	4.11	4.26	2.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	1315/1316	2.67	3.86	4.14	4.34	1.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	1	4	0	0	1	2.33	1408/1427	3.33	4.09	4.19	4.25	2.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1407/1447	3.94	4.48	4.69	4.74	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	2	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1385/1434	3.15	3.88	4.10	4.21	2.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	1	1	3.14	1341/1387	3.90	4.39	4.46	4.51	3.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	2	2	2	1	3.29	1374/1387	3.81	4.34	4.73	4.81	3.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	6	1	0	3.14	1316/1386	3.74	4.33	4.32	4.43	3.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	4	3	0	0	2.43	1360/1380	3.38	4.19	4.32	4.38	2.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	4	0	1	2.71	1141/1193	3.52	3.88	4.02	4.02	2.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	1122/1172	3.44	4.08	4.15	4.32	2.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	4	2	0	0	1	1.86	1182/1182	3.18	3.89	4.35	4.46	1.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	4	0	0	2	2.71	1155/1170	3.36	4.15	4.38	4.52	2.71
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	3	2	0	2	0	2.14	792/ 800	3.07	4.03	4.06	4.10	2.14

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	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 responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 53 2
 Title ESL: ADV SPEAK & LISTE
 Instructor: Draganescu,Mari
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 570
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1290/1447	3.08	3.91	4.31	4.46	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1053/1447	3.00	4.10	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1241	3.10	4.11	4.33	4.38	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	685/1402	3.29	4.07	4.24	4.29	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1084/1358	2.90	3.87	4.11	4.26	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1050/1316	2.67	3.86	4.14	4.34	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	680/1427	3.33	4.09	4.19	4.25	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1361/1447	3.94	4.48	4.69	4.74	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1238/1434	3.15	3.88	4.10	4.21	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	566/1387	3.90	4.39	4.46	4.51	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1229/1387	3.81	4.34	4.73	4.81	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	811/1386	3.74	4.33	4.32	4.43	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	815/1380	3.38	4.19	4.32	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	420/1193	3.52	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	710/1172	3.44	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	553/1182	3.18	3.89	4.35	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	864/1170	3.36	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	423/ 800	3.07	4.03	4.06	4.10	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 71 01
 Title ESLTOP III: ADV WRT FR
 Instructor: Follett, Sonja
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 571
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	254/1447	4.80	3.91	4.31	4.46	4.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	426/1447	4.60	4.10	4.27	4.30	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.11	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	380/1402	4.60	4.07	4.24	4.29	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	280/1358	4.60	3.87	4.11	4.26	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	292/1316	4.60	3.86	4.14	4.34	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	154/1427	4.80	4.09	4.19	4.25	4.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.80	4.48	4.69	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.50	3.88	4.10	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	353/1387	4.80	4.39	4.46	4.51	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	1055/1387	4.60	4.34	4.73	4.81	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	510/1386	4.60	4.33	4.32	4.43	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	549/1380	4.60	4.19	4.32	4.38	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	224/1193	4.60	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	619/1172	4.20	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	490/1182	4.60	3.89	4.35	4.46	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	327/1170	4.80	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.03	4.06	4.10	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	3	A 4	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 1	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 4	Non-major 5
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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ELC 73 01
 Title ESL: ADV Oral Presenta
 Instructor: Janjigian, Kenne
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 572
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	287/1447	4.78	3.91	4.31	4.46	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	228/1447	4.78	4.10	4.27	4.30	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.11	4.33	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	314/1402	4.67	4.07	4.24	4.29	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	237/1358	4.67	3.87	4.11	4.26	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	342/1316	4.56	3.86	4.14	4.34	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	181/1427	4.78	4.09	4.19	4.25	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.48	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	296/1434	4.57	3.88	4.10	4.21	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1387	4.89	4.39	4.46	4.51	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.34	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	159/1386	4.89	4.33	4.32	4.43	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	181/1380	4.89	4.19	4.32	4.38	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	75/1193	4.88	3.88	4.02	4.02	4.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	203/1172	4.78	4.08	4.15	4.32	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	329/1182	4.78	3.89	4.35	4.46	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.89	4.15	4.38	4.52	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	133/ 800	4.67	4.03	4.06	4.10	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELCA 503 02
 Title ELC53
 Instructor: Draganescu, Mari
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 573
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.22	4.31	4.46	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1447	4.63	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	478/1241	4.57	3.75	4.33	4.38	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	217/1402	4.75	3.76	4.24	4.29	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	727/1358	4.13	4.01	4.11	4.26	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	738/1316	4.13	3.92	4.14	4.34	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.66	4.19	4.25	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	565/1447	4.88	4.95	4.69	4.74	4.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.13	4.10	4.21	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.88	4.55	4.46	4.51	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	859/1387	4.75	4.79	4.73	4.81	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.22	4.32	4.43	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.19	4.32	4.38	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	89/1193	4.83	4.04	4.02	4.02	4.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	309/1172	4.63	4.31	4.15	4.32	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	737/1182	4.25	4.58	4.35	4.46	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.80	4.38	4.52	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	366/ 800	4.20	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 8	Non-major 9
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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 3		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ELCA 504 01
 Title ELC54
 Instructor: Palmer, Tsisana
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 574
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1058/1447	3.80	4.22	4.31	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1053/1447	3.90	4.28	4.27	4.30	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1241	3.67	3.75	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	976/1402	3.50	3.76	4.24	4.29	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	1	4	2	3.75	1022/1358	3.75	4.01	4.11	4.26	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	985/1316	3.39	3.92	4.14	4.34	3.78
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	181/1427	4.09	4.66	4.19	4.25	4.78
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	538/1447	4.84	4.95	4.69	4.74	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	230/1434	4.21	4.13	4.10	4.21	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	230/1387	4.34	4.55	4.46	4.51	4.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	829/1387	4.39	4.79	4.73	4.81	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	607/1386	4.05	4.22	4.32	4.43	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	3	4	4.00	1030/1380	3.60	4.19	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	593/1193	3.46	4.04	4.02	4.02	4.13
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	282/1172	4.33	4.31	4.15	4.32	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	0	2	5	4.11	824/1182	3.76	4.58	4.35	4.46	4.11
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	364/1170	4.49	4.80	4.38	4.52	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	195/ 800	4.00	3.72	4.06	4.10	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3	Under-grad 9	Non-major 10
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	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: ELCA 504 02
 Title ELC54
 Instructor: Palmer, Tsisana
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 575
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1310/1447	3.80	4.22	4.31	4.46	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1210/1447	3.90	4.28	4.27	4.30	3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1096/1241	3.67	3.75	4.33	4.38	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1359/1402	3.50	3.76	4.24	4.29	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1022/1358	3.75	4.01	4.11	4.26	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1257/1316	3.39	3.92	4.14	4.34	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1291/1427	4.09	4.66	4.19	4.25	3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	754/1447	4.84	4.95	4.69	4.74	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1088/1434	4.21	4.13	4.10	4.21	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1253/1387	4.34	4.55	4.46	4.51	3.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1320/1387	4.39	4.79	4.73	4.81	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1237/1386	4.05	4.22	4.32	4.43	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	3.20	1303/1380	3.60	4.19	4.32	4.38	3.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	1130/1193	3.46	4.04	4.02	4.02	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	710/1172	4.33	4.31	4.15	4.32	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1106/1182	3.76	4.58	4.35	4.46	3.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	798/1170	4.49	4.80	4.38	4.52	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	655/ 800	4.00	3.72	4.06	4.10	3.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 0			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 1	Under-grad 5	Non-major 5
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 responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			