Course Section: ELC 041 8010 Title

Baltimore County ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR Fall 2006

Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Page 652 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
g 1														
General  1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4 00	1173/1669	3.65	3.97	1 22	4.02	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2		1257/1666	3.53	4.01	4.23	4.02	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2		1181/1421	3.40	3.86	4.19	4.11	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2		1196/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	963/1555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2		1043/1543	3.60		4.06	3.86	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	2		1517/1647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7		1106/1668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	918/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07		4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	799/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	5		1193/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	753/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1069/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	846/1311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1038/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	479/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	1.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	***	4.67	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	1.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 55	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 42	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46	2.40	3.20	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 33	3.33	3.33	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.22	****

Course Section: ELC 041 8010 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR

University of Maryland Baltimore County COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Instructor:

Fall 2006

Page 652 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	С	0	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	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR Instructor:

9 Enrollment: Questionnaires: 8 (Instr. B)

Fall 2006

Page 653 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	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	2	4	2		1173/1669		3.97	4.23	4.02	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2		1257/1666		4.01	4.19	4.11	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2		1181/1421		3.86	4.24		3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2		1196/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	3		963/1555		3.97	4.00	3.92	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3			1043/1543		4.01	4.06	3.86	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1			1517/1647		3.73	4.12	4.06	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	1.00	1106/1668		4.84			4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	1		1193/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1		556/1503		4.07	4.24	4.17	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0			1069/1506				4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	1			1115/1311					3.54
5. Did dudiovibual teeminqueb emanee jour underbeamaring		Ü	Ü	_	Ü	_	Ü	3.00	1113/1311	3.13	3.77	3.03	3.00	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	,		3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1038/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	479/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	1.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar	-	0	0	^	0	1	_	4 00	±±±±/ 110			4 20	4 0 4	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	, -		1.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	,	***	4.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	****/ 55	2 =0	2 62	1 21	1 17	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7					1	-		,	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		****/ 42 ****/ 46	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful						-	-				3.20	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7 7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	,	3.33	3.33	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	/	U	U	0	U	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	4.00	3./5	4.34	4.22	

Course Section: ELC 041 8010 University of Maryland Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR Baltimore County

(Instr. B)

Instructor:

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8

Fall 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 653

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	С	0	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	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	1						

WRITING & GRAMMAR Baltimore County

Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR Instructor: (Instr. C)

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland

Fall 2006

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 654 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	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	0	0	2	4	2		1173/1669	3.65	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1257/1666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1181/1421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2		1196/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88		3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2		1043/1543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1			1517/1647		3.73	4.12	4.06	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7		1106/1668		4.84	4.67	4.62	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	1		1404/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	_		1066/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	_		1319/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00					3.68	3.54
	-		•	-	-	_	-							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1038/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	479/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00
T . D														
Laboratory	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	++++/ 226	****	2 50	4 20	2 00	****
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7 7	0	0	0	0	1 1	0		****/ 226 ****/ 233	1.00	3.50	4.20	3.98 4.09	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 225	****	2.50 3.75	4.19	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.42	****
3. Were requirements for tab reports creatry specified	,	U	U	U	U	_	U	4.00	/ 200		4.07	4.13	4.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	1.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 42	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46	2.40	3.20	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 33	3.33	3.33	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 29	4.00		4.34	4.22	****
		-	-		-	•	-		,					

ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR

Title Instructor:

(Instr. C)

Questionnaires: 8

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 654 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	С	0	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	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

University of Maryland
Baltimore County
Fall 2006

Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR Instructor: (Instr. D)

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 8

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies

Instructor

Page 655 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Course Dept UMBC Level Sect

			LTC	:quei	TCTE	5		TIID	LIUCLUI	Course	Debr	OMPC	телет	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	2	4	2		1173/1669		3.97	4.23	4.02	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2		1257/1666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1181/1421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1196/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	963/1555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1043/1543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1517/1647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1106/1668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1330/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.09
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	939/1311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.54
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1038/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	479/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	1.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.01	****
o. More requirements for tax reports creating appearing	•	Ū	ŭ	Ū	ŭ	-	Ü	1.00	, 200		1.07	1.15	1.01	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	1.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 98	****		3.95	3.90	****
J. Were criteria for grading made crear	,	O	O	O	_	O	O	3.00	, 50		1.00	3.75	3.70	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	Λ	4 00	****/ 58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	/	U	U	U	1	U	U	3.00	/ 30			4.33	4.30	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 42	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 46	2.40	3.20	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 33	3.33			4.25	****
	7	0	0	0	U T	1	0		,			4.25		****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	/	U	U	U	U	Τ	U	4.00	****/ 29	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.22	

Course Section: ELC 041 8010 University of Maryland JAN 18, 2007

Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR Baltimore County Instructor: (Instr. D) Fall 2006

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

## Frequency Distribution

Page 655

Job IRBR3029

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	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	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				2	1						

ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR

Title Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE

Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 6

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 656 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Question	ıs		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	3	5	Ins Mean	tructor Ran		Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			Genera	.l																
1. D	id you	gain n	ew insights,ski	.lls fro	om this course	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1660/1	669	3.65	3.97	4.23	4.02	2.33
2. D	id the	instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1648/1	666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	2.33
3. D	id the	exam q	uestions reflec	t the $\epsilon$	expected goals	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1401/1	421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	2.60
4. D	id oth	er eval	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	1591/1	617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	2.50
5. D	id ass	igned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1521/1	555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	2.50
6. D	id wri	tten as:	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	2.83	1476/1	543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	2.83
			g system clearl		ined	0	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1510/1	647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.17
			was class cand			0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1	668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. H	low wou	ld you	grade the overa	ıll teac	ching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1568/1	605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	2.40
			Lectur	re																
1. W	Mere th	e instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1352/1	514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	3.67
2. D	id the	instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1545/1	551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	2.83
3. W	as lec	ture ma	terial presente	ed and e	explained clearly	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	1485/1	503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	2.17
4. D	id the	lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1490/1	506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	2.00
5. D	id aud	iovisua	l techniques er	ıhance y	our understanding	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1264/1	311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	2.20
			Discus	sion																
1. D	oid cla	ss disc	ussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	1.67	1486/1	490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	1.67
2. W	ere al	l stude	nts actively en	ıcourage	ed to participate	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1434/1	502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	2.83
3. D	id the	instru	ctor encourage	fair ar	nd open discussion	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1454/1	489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	2.67
4. W	lere sp	ecial t	echniques succe	essful		0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1	006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	***
			Labora	itory																
2. W	Jere yo	u provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	233/	233	1.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	1.00
			Field	Work																
1. D	id fie	ld expe	rience contribu	ite to v	hat you learned	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	56/	58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	1.33
2. D	oid you	clearl	y understand yo	ur eval	uation criteria	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	52/	52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	1.33
			Self	Paced																
1. D	oid sel	f-paced	system contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	53/	55	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	2.50
2. D	id stu	dy ques	tions make clea	ir the $\epsilon$	expected goal	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	41/	42	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	2.75
3. W	lere yo	ur conta	acts with the i	nstruct	or helpful	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	46/	46	2.40	3.20	4.45	4.26	2.40
4. W	as the	feedba	ck/tutoring by	proctor	s helpful	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	27/	33	3.33	3.33	4.25	4.25	3.33
5. W	ere th	ere eno	ugh proctors fo	r all t	the students	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	17/	29	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.22	4.00
					Frequ	ency	Dis	trib	utio	ı										
Cred	lits Ea	rned	Cum. GPA	<u> </u>	Expected Grades				Re:	asons					Тур	20			Majors	•
											, 									, 
00- 28-		3 0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 0	A 0 B 1		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	5	3	Grad	uate	3	0	Majo	or	0
26- 56-		0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	nera	1				0	Unde	r-ar	rad	6	Non-	-major	6
	150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		061	c. a.	-				J	onde	- 91	- uu	•	INOII		U
Gra		0	3.50-4.00	0	F 1		E. J.	ecti	ves				1	####	_ 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ıh
GLA		J	3.30 1.00	J	P 0		11.1	CCL	v CD				_			es to b			_	) <u>+</u> +
					I O		O+1	ner					3	rcsb	0110	-2 CO L	5191	Ca1		
					? 1		0.01						-							

Course Section: ELC 041 8031 University of Maryland ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR Baltimore County

I

?

0

0

Title Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE Fall 2006

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 11

Studen	t Course	Evalı	uation	Quest	ionna:	ire
--------	----------	-------	--------	-------	--------	-----

Page 657

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

							Fr	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mear
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1462/1669	3.65	3.97	4.23	4.02	3.55
2. Did th	ne instruc	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	1	3.36	1520/1666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	3.36
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1298/1421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.30
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	1	0	9	0	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.00
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	1	3	3.45	1265/1555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.4
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	1339/1543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.2
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	1	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1521/1647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.10
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	3	4	0	3.11	1493/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	3.1
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1303/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	3.82
2. Did th	e instruc	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1460/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	3.8
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	explained clearly	0	0	1	0	8	0		3.18	1404/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	3.1
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	1	2	5	1	2	3.09	1398/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	3.0
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	2	3	4	1		2.40	1245/1311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	2.40
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	3	0	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1421/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.63
2. Were a	ıll studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	3	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1388/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	3.13
				nd open discussion	3	0	3	1	3	1	0	2.25	1477/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	2.25
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	_	3	4	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	997/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	2.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons				Ту	ne			Majors	:
										-								. – – – -
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s	б	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 8														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.1	Non-	-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				2	#### -				_	βh
				Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				_														

Other

Course Section: ELC 042 8010 University of Maryland ESL:READING & VOCAB DE Baltimore County

Title Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T Fall 2006

Enrollment: 9

Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 658

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			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	1	4	2	4.14	1052/1669	4.01	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1148/1421	4.00	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	922/1617	4.21	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	773/1555	4.41	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	895/1543	4.31	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.00
<ol> <li>Was the grading system clearly explained</li> </ol>	0	1	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	1474/1647	3.69	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	918/1605	4.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	715/1514	4.39	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.72	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	491/1503	4.47	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1209/1506	4.15	4.01	4.26	4.17	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	587/1311	3.84	3.77	3.85	3.68	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1490	4.17	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	880/1502	4.14	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.33	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	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	0	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	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	1						

ESL:READING & VOCAB DE

Title VALAIS, TERESA

Instructor:

Questionnaires: 6

Enrollment:

9

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 659 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

				equer					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	0	2	3	4.00	1173/1669	4.01	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	549/1666	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	557/1421	4.00	3.86	4.24	4.11	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	641/1617	4.21	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1555	4.41	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	130/1543	4.31	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	651/1647	3.69	3.73	4.12	4.06	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	844/1668	4.88	4.84		4.62	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	499/1605	4.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.39	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	4.72	4.42	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1503	4.47	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	249/1506	4.15	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	3.84	3.77	3.85	3.68	4.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	622/1490	4.17	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1502	4.14	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	348/1489	4.33	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	424/1006	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	192/ 226	3.50	3.50	4.20	3.98	3.50
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	146/ 233	4.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	1	0	0	1		3.75	209/ 225	3.75	3.75	4.50	4.42	3.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	164/ 223	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.19	4.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 206	4.67	4.67	4.15	4.01	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	4	0	0	1	0	0			****	****	4.38	4.04	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 92	****	1.00	4.22	3.79	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	72/ 105	4.00	4.00	4.20	3.94	4.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.90	4.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	57/ 58	1.25	1.29	4.22	4.00	1.25
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	48/ 52	2.00	1.67	4.06	3.81	2.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	4	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	3	0	1	0	1	0		34/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	52/ 55	2.75	2.63	4.34	4.17	2.75
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 42	4.33	3.54	4.31	4.08	4.33
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	31/ 46	4.00		4.45	4.26	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	3.33	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	23/ 29	3.50	3.75	4.34	4.22	3.50

Title ESL:READING & VOCAB DE

Instructor: VALAIS, TERESA

Enrollment: 9
Questionnaires: 6

READING & VOCAB DE Baltimore County IS, TERESA Fall 2006

Page 659 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	 Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
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	2				
				?	1						

Course Section: ELC 042 8012 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title ESL:READING & VOCAB DE Fall 2006

Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 660

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		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	0	0	3	5	2	3.90	1288/1669	4.01	3.97	4.23	4.02	3.90
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3		1037/1666	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	3		1118/1421	4.00	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	970/1617	4.21	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	438/1555	4.41	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	832/1543	4.31	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	1474/1647	3.69	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	901/1668	4.88	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	830/1605	4.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	1 11	1166/1514	4.39	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	5		1239/1551	4.72	4.33	4.66	4.55	4.11
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	2	2		1066/1503	4.72	4.42	4.24	4.17	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	1		1236/1506	4.47	4.07	4.24	4.17	3.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	3	3	2	1		1100/1311	3.84	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.76
5. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	U	U	3	3	۷	1	3.11	1100/1311	3.04	3.77	3.05	3.00	3.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1088/1490	4.17	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1253/1502	4.14	3.93	4.26	4.06	3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	973/1489	4.33	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	632/1006	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.81	3.83
Freq	encv	Dist	rib	utio	า									
11040					-									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	10	Non-major	10
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	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA

Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN

Distriction Dieber,

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 8

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 661 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	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	2	6	4.75	269/1669	4.75	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	4.86	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421	4.67	3.86	4.24	4.11	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	673/1617	4.38	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	285/1555	4.57	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.71	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	250/1647	4.71	3.73	4.12	4.06	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1605	4.60	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.42	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1503	4.83	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.77	3.85	3.68	5.00
5. Fix additional committees committees four analysemaning		_	Ū	Ü	Ü	Ü		3.00	1,1311	5.00	3.,,	3.05	3.00	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1215/1490	3.40	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1279/1502	3.60	3.93	4.26	4.06	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1318/1489	3.40	3.93	4.29	4.07	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	4.67	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 233	****	2.50	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 223	****	4.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.01	***
Field Work	_	0	0	•		_	-	F 00	50	also also also also	1 00	4 00	4 00	***
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58	****	1.29	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52		1.67	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	U	U	U	U	1	5.00	****/ 30	***	****	4.33	4.30	***
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 55	****	2.63	4.34	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 42	****	3.54	4.31	4.17	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 46	****	3.20	4.45	4.06	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 33	****	3.33	4.45	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 29	****	3.75	4.34	4.22	****
5. Hold didde chough proceeds for all the beautiful	,	J	J	J	J	_	J	1.00	, 25		3.73	1.51	1.22	

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	А	5	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı

P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 4 .

ESL:ADV READING & VOCA

Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN

Enrollment: 14
Questionnaires: 8

Title

#### University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 662 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	769/1669	4.38	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	412/1666	4.63	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	746/1421	4.33	3.86	4.24	4.11	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	496/1617	4.50	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	461/1555	4.38	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	345/1647	4.63	3.73	4.12	4.06	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	499/1605	4.40	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.42	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	104/1311			3.85	3.68	4.83
o. Dia addivipadi dedimique dimande your anderboanding	_	ŭ	Ü	Ü	ŭ	-		1.05	101/1011	1.05	3.,,	3.03	3.00	1.05
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	920/1502	4.20	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	800/1489	4.40	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	407/1006	4.20	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	2.50	4.19	4.09	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.00	4.35	4.19	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	***	4.67	4.15	4.01	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****
Field Work	_		_						= 0					
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 58	****	1.29	4.22	4.00	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	2.63	4.34	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.54	4.31	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.20	4.45	4.26	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	3.33	4.25	4.25	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	3.75	4.34	4.22	****

Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA

Instructor:

BRESEE, SUSAN

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 8

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 662 JAN 18, 2007 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	 А	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course Section: ELC 053 8010 University of Maryland Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN

Instructor:

CHASE, JUDITH

Baltimore County Fall 2006

Page 663

JAN 18, 2007

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 10 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

							Fr	eque:	ncies	;		Ins	tructor	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 vo	u gain ne	Genera w insights,ski		this course	0	0	1	1	2	3	3	3 60	1437/1669	3.60	3.97	4.23	4.02	3.60
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	2	1	3	4		1235/1666		4.01	4.19	4.11	3.90
		estions reflec			0	5	1	0	0	2	2		1118/1421		3.86	4.24	4.11	3.80
		ations reflect			0	0	1	0	2	3	4		1168/1617	3.90	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.90
				hat you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	2		1227/1555	3.50	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.50
				what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	4	0		1294/1543		4.01	4.06	3.86	3.43
		g system clearl			0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	806/1647	4.30	3.73	4.12	4.06	4.30
		was class canc			0	0	0	0	0	2	8		901/1668		4.84	4.67	4.62	4.80
	-			ing effectiveness	3	1	0	2	1	2	-		1428/1605		3.94			3.33
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lecture	s well p	repared	0	0	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	1369/1514	3.60	4.33	4.39	4.32	3.60
		ctor seem inter			0	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	1361/1551	4.20	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.20
				plained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1261/1503	3.70	4.07	4.24	4.17	3.70
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute t	o what y	ou learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1025/1506	4.10	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.10
5. Did au	diovisual	l techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	0	1	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	712/1311	3.89	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.89
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	742/1490	4.20	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20
2. Were a	ll studer	nts actively en	couraged	to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	754/1502	4.40	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.40
3. Did th	e instruc	ctor encourage	fair and	open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	800/1489	4.40	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.40
4. Were s	pecial te	echniques succe	ssful		0	1	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00
		Labora	tory															
2. Were y	ou provid	ded with adequa	te backg	round information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	2.50	4.19	4.09	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio:	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	A 8		 Re/	anir		or Ma	iore		3	Graduat		2	Majo		0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		1/6/	quil	cu I	J⊥ 14C	י זייי י	,	J	Graduat	_	4	Ma JC	) <u>+</u>	U
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	-major	10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0		001	c. a	-				_	onaci g		-	1,011		
Grad.	2	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti <sup>.</sup>	ves				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ιh
32 44.	-	3.30 1.30	ŭ	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Ot.1	her					3	10050110		91			
				? 0														

Course Section: ELC 054 8010 University of Maryland ESL:X-CULTURAL COMMUNC

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 2

1

Page 664 Title Baltimore County JAN 18, 2007 Instructor: CHASE, JUDITH Fall 2006 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	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	3.97	4.23	4.02	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.01	4.19	4.11	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.86	4.24	4.11	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	3.95	4.15	3.99	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	340/1555	4.50	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.01	4.06	3.86	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.73	4.12	4.06	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	3.94		3.96	5.00
									,					
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.32	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.42	4.66	4.55	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.01	4.26	4.17	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.77	3.85	3.68	5.00
Discussion														
	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	г оо	1/1490	5.00	3.86	4.05	2 05	5.00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	•	-	0	0	0	1	2	5.00 4.50	632/1502	4.50	3.88	4.05	3.85 4.06	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0		0	-	1	Τ		,					4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	•	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.93	4.29	4.07	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	Т	Τ	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.50
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	92/ 92	1.00	1.00	4.22	3.79	1.00
· ·														
Freque	anas	Dia	+rih	ut i o	n									

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	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	2	Non-major	2
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			
				P	0			responses to be significant		gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				2	Λ						