Baltimore County Spring 2008

Course-Section: LING 190 0101

43

WORLD OF LANGUAGE

WESTPHAL, GERMA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 33

University of Maryland

Instructor

Page 1004

AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

	Ouestionnaire

Frequencies

		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 al															
1. Did you	u gain ne			m this course	0	0	1	5	8	12	7	3.58	1518/1670	3.58	4.36	4.31	4.23	3.58
_	_	tor make clear			0	0	5	2	11	13	2	3.15	1589/1666	3.15	4.31	4.27	4.30	3.15
				expected goals	0	0	4	5	6	12	6	3.33	1314/1406	3.33	4.48	4.32	4.31	3.33
4. Did oth	her evalu	ations reflect	t the ex	spected goals	0	9	3	3	4	11	3	3.33	1512/1615	3.33	4.34	4.24	4.17	3.33
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	0	3	9	7	14	3.97	914/1566	3.97	4.26	4.07	4.03	3.97
6. Did wri	itten ass	ignments conti	ribute t	to what you learned	1	2	6	4	7	6	7	3.13	1431/1528	3.13	4.23	4.12	4.00	3.13
7. Was the	e grading	system clear	ly expla	ined	0	0	0	2	3	7	21	4.42	690/1650	4.42	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.42
8. How mar	ny times	was class cand	celled		1	1	0	0	1	13	17	4.52	1149/1667	4.52	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.52
9. How wou	uld you g	rade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	6	2	6	5	11	3	0	2.44	1598/1626	2.44	4.08	4.11	4.07	2.44
		Lectu																
		ctor's lecture			2	0	5	3	15	2	6		1517/1559	3.03	4.38	4.46	4.47	3.03
		n the subject	2	0	7 2	5	4	6	9		1544/1560	3.16	4.75	4.72	4.68	3.16		
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearl							6	8	10	5		1445/1549	3.32	4.34	4.31	4.32	3.32
	1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand:							4	8	9	5		1469/1546	3.09	4.40	4.32	4.32	3.09
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	nhance y	our understanding	1	7	3	6	5	6	5	3.16	1155/1323	3.16	3.96	4.00	3.91	3.16
		Discus	aaion															
1 Did als	acc dican			what you learned	19	0	5	4	1	1	3	2 50	1333/1384	2.50	4.29	4.10	3.92	2.50
				ed to participate	19	0	1	2	5	2	4		1221/1378	3.43	4.56	4.29	4.09	3.43
		_	_	nd open discussion	19	0	2	2	5	2	3		1295/1378	3.14	4.45	4.31	4.08	3.14
		chniques succe		a open arbeablion	19	11	0	0	1	1	1		****/ 904		4.11	4.03	3.94	****
1	900141 00	omizques suco	555141				Ü	ŭ	_	_	_	1.00	, , , , ,			1.00	3.71	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Δ	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Тур	ne.			Majors	
															, . – – – –			
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 7						Red	quire	ed f	or M	lajor	s	8	Graduate	9	0	Majo	r	4
28-55 6 1.00-1.99 0 B 17																		
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 2 C 5						Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-gr	rad 3	3	Non-	major	29
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad.							ectiv	ves				3	#### - N				_	ſh
	P 0												response	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	

Other

18

I

?

0

1

Course-Section: LING 290 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO APPLIED LING Baltimore County Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00 5

3

D

F

Р

I

0

0

0

0

0

23

Page 1005 AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

#### - Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Questionnaires: 18 Student Course Evaluation Questionna	Ouestionnaires:	18	Student Course	Evaluation '	Ouestionnair
---	-----------------	----	----------------	--------------	--------------

Quescionn	aires.	10		Student Cot	ILSE	Eval	uati	OII Q	uesti	.0111	lalle	:						
							Fr	eanei	ncies	3		Tnst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	ns		NR	NA	1	_		4	5		Rank		_		Mean	
1 Did 170	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski		om this sourse	0	0	0	0	3	1	14	4.61	544/1670	4.61	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.61
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	1	0	Ω	9	4.39	808/1666		4.31	4.27	4.27	4.39
		uestions reflec		_	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	352/1406		4.48	4.32	4.39	4.72
	_	uations reflect			0	1	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	898/1615		4.34	4.24	4.29	4.24
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	250/1566		4.26	4.07	4.00	4.72
				to what you learned	0	4	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	679/1528		4.23	4.12	4.11	4.29
		g system clear!		_	0	0	0	1	1	4	12	4.50	,		4.16	4.22	4.20	4.50
		was class cand		211100	0	0	0	0	0	9	9		1157/1667		4.47	4.67	4.64	
	_			ching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	6	8		- ,		4.08	4.11		4.33
1 Maria L	b	Lectu			0	0	0	0	1	2	1 -	4.78	486/1559	4.78	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.78
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0		15 17				4.75	4.72	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	1	0		14	4.67			4.75	4.72	4.73	4.67
		es contribute t			0	0	0	0	1		17				4.40	4.32	4.30	
				your understanding	0	2	0	0	1	4	11		,				4.08	
				,	-	_	-	•	_	_								
		Discus																
				what you learned	8	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	541/1384		4.29	4.10	4.07	4.40
				ed to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2			,		4.56	4.29	4.25	4.60
				nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1378		4.45	4.31	4.26	4.80
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succe	essful		8	3	1	0	4	0	2	3.29	790/ 904	3.29	4.11	4.03	4.01	3.29
		Self	Paced															
1. Did se	lf-paced			what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	***	***	4.64	****	****
				Frequ	iencs	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
				11040		210	0110		-									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	`s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	r )r	9
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	в 8			-			-						,		
56-83	5	C 1		General 1 Under-grad 1						8	Non-major		9					

Electives

Other

3

12

Course-Section: LING 310 0101 University of Maryland Page 1006 Title PHONOLOGY & MORPHOLOGY Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: KA, OMAR

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			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	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	849/1670	4.38	4.36	4.31	4.24	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	5	5	3.75	1409/1666	3.75	4.31	4.27	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	3	3	5	2	3.29	1320/1406	3.29	4.48	4.32	4.22	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	3	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	1083/1615	4.00	4.34	4.24	4.18	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	8	4.14	752/1566	4.14	4.26	4.07	4.04	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	1	3	6	3.85	1088/1528	3.85	4.23	4.12	4.07	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	690/1650	4.43	4.16	4.22	4.12	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1236/1667	4.43	4.47	4.67	4.67	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	6	6	3	3.80	1220/1626	3.80	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	640/1559	4.69	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.67	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	1308/1549	3.75	4.34	4.31	4.25	3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	4	2	8	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	11	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1323	****	3.96	4.00	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	2	2	1	2	3.43	1133/1384	3.43	4.29	4.10	4.12	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	441/1378	4.71	4.56	4.29	4.30	4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	731/1378	4.43	4.45	4.31	4.33	4.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	6	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 904		4.11	4.03	4.03	****

## Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	A	Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	10	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enoug	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	13	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: LING 410 0101 University of Maryland LANGUAGE PLANNING Baltimore County

Page 1007 Title AUG 6, 2008 Instructor: KA, OMAR Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029 Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 11 Student Course Evaluation Questionnair
---

		Ouestion	a		MD	NA	Fr 1	eque:	ncies 3	3	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Quescion	5 									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	8	4.73	401/1670	4.73	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.73
2. Did the	e instru	ctor make clear	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	173/1666	4.91	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.91
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the ex	xpected goals	0	10	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	****	4.48	4.32	4.48	****
4. Did otl	her eval	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	317/1615	4.73	4.34	4.24	4.37	4.73
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to v	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	317/1566	4.64	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.64
6. Did wr	itten as:	signments contr	ibute to	what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	769/1528	4.18	4.23	4.12	4.26	4.18
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearl	y expla:	ined	0	0	0	2	1	0	8	4.27	879/1650	4.27	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.27
8. How man	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	9	2	4.18	1416/1667	4.18	4.47	4.67	4.73	4.18
9. How wor	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	704/1626	4.27	4.08	4.11	4.28	4.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well ]	prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	623/1559	4.70	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.70
2. Did the	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1560	5.00	4.75	4.72	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	1	2	7	4.60	562/1549	4.60	4.34	4.31	4.43	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					1	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	655/1546	4.56	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.56
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	608/1384	4.33	4.29	4.10	4.32	4.33
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	5	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	603/1378	4.50	4.56	4.29	4.55	4.50
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair and	d open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	354/1378	4.83	4.45	4.31	4.60	4.83
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		5	4	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 904	****	4.11	4.03	4.22	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	A 8		 Red	anir	ed f	or Ma			0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	9			
28-55							Jull	ca I	J_ 1/1C	ــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــــ	_	J	Graduat	_		1.10.10	/ <b>_</b>	,
56-83						Gei	nera	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	1	Non-	-major	2
84-150						001	c. a	-				-	onder 9		-	1,011		-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enono	rh
5144.	ŭ	3.33 1.30	ŭ	P 0								_	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot.1	her				1	.0					-	
			001					_	-									

Course-Section: LING 470 0101 University of Maryl Title LANGUAGE & COGNITION Baltimore County Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA Spring 2008

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Spring 2008

5

Page 1008 AUG 6, 2008

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	11	
Questionnaires:	7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

I

?

0

0

Quescionn	u11 CD.	,		beddene coe	LDC	пуат	aacı	J11 Q	46561	. 011110		-						
							Fre	eque	ncies	;		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 you	u gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fr	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	780/1670	4.43	4.36	4.31	4.45	4.43
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the e	xpected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	931/1666	4.29	4.31	4.27	4.35	4.29
3. Did the	e exam qı	uestions reflec	t the	expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1406	5 ****	4.48	4.32	4.48	***
4. Did otl	her evalı	uations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	775/1615	4.33	4.34	4.24	4.37	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	258/1566	4.71	4.26	4.07	4.17	4.71
				to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	787/1528	3 4.17	4.23	4.12	4.26	4.17
		g system clearl		ained	0	0	0	0	3	2	2		1304/1650		4.16	4.22	4.28	3.86
	-	was class cand			0	0	0	0	2	4			1617/1667		4.47	4.67	4.73	3.86
9. How wor	uld you g	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1172/1626	3.86	4.08	4.11	4.28	3.86
		Lectur	·e															
1. Were th	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	673/1559	4.67	4.38	4.46	4.58	4.67
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1326/1560	4.40	4.75	4.72	4.80	4.40
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and	explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	977/1549	4.25	4.34	4.31	4.43	4.25
4. Did the	1. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned							1	0	1	2	4.00	1139/1546	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.43	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	692/1323	4.00	3.96	4.00	4.10	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cla	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1384	4.86	4.29	4.10	4.32	4.86
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	441/1378	3 4.71	4.56	4.29	4.55	4.71
3. Did the	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	481/1378	3 4.71	4.45	4.31	4.60	4.71
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	5	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	461/ 904	4.00	4.11	4.03	4.22	4.00
		Semina	ır															
1. Were as	ssigned t	opics relevant	to the	e announced theme	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	7 ****	5.00	4.65	4.80	***
4. Did pro	esentatio	ons contribute	to what	t you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 79	****	4.88	4.45	4.53	****
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading mad	le clea:	r	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.13	3.97	3.67	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Re	asons				ጥኣ	/pe			Majors	2
							, 											
00-27							quire	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	3
	28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 1					<b>a</b>		1				2	TTm d acc		7	Mac		4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera:	T				2	Under-	jrad	7	non-	-major	4
	84-150 3 3.00-3.49 2 D 0						Electives 0 #### - Means there are							~h				
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		E16	ECLI,	ves				0				e are not enough ignificant		
			P U								_	respons	ses to I	e sign	ıııcaı	IL		

Other

Course-Section: LING 694 0101 University of Maryland Page 1009 Title THE GRAMMAR OF AMERICA Baltimore County AUG 6, 2008 Spring 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 11

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Ouestions	3		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			- 															
		Genera	l															
1. Did you	ı gain nev	v insights,ski	lls fro	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1670	5.00	4.36	4.31	4.46	5.00
		or make clear			1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	173/1666	4.90	4.31	4.27	4.34	4.90
3. Did the	e exam que	estions reflect	the e	xpected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	261/1406	4.80	4.48	4.32	4.36	4.80
4. Did oth	ner evalua	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	176/1615	4.90	4.34	4.24	4.33	4.90
5. Did ass	signed rea	adings contrib	ite to	what you learned	1	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	159/1566	4.86	4.26	4.07	4.20	4.86
		_		what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	131/1528	4.89	4.23	4.12	4.33	4.89
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y expla	ined	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	159/1650	4.90	4.16	4.22	4.30	4.90
	-	was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1667	5.00	4.47	4.67	4.74	5.00
9. How wou	ıld you gr	rade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	595/1626	4.38	4.08	4.11	4.20	4.38
		Lecture																
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject								0	1	10	4.91	276/1559		4.38	4.46	4.49	4.91
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject							0	0	1	10	4.91	596/1560		4.75	4.72	4.81	4.91
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly							0	1	0	10	4.82	284/1549		4.34	4.31	4.37	4.82
	4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	0	10	4.82	333/1546		4.40	4.32	4.40	4.82
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	2	5	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	917/1323	3.75	3.96	4.00	4.03	3.75
		Discus																
				what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	195/1384		4.29	4.10	4.21	4.86
				d to participate	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	481/1378		4.56	4.29	4.42	4.67
		_		d open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	302/1378		4.45	4.31	4.51	4.89
4. Were sp	pecial ted	chniques succes	ssful		3	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	718/ 904	3.50	4.11	4.03	4.04	3.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	1									
								_					_					
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad								Rea	asons	3 			Ту	pe 			Majors	
00-27 3 0.00-0.99 0 A 6						Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s	0	Graduat	е	6	Majo	or	0
28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 0																		
56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0						Ger	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad	5	Non-	major	11
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 0 D 0																		
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_								_						

Other

8

I

0

1