Course-Section: ELC 041 8010 University of Maryland ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 596

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE Enrollment: 4

Ouestionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Questions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2 0 0 0 0 4.00 1069/1481 4.00 4.26 4.29 4.14 4.00 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1000/1481 4.00 4.26 4.23 4.18 4.00 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1118/1249 3.50 4.37 4.27 4.14 3.50 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 2 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 1361/1424 3.00 4.27 4.21 4.06 3.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 0 1 0 3.00 1292/1396 3.00 4.07 3.98 3.89 3.00 0 2.50 1326/1342 2.50 4.12 4.07 3.88 2.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 2 0 1 0 1 0 0 2.00 1438/1459 2.00 4.19 4.16 4.17 2.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 5.00 1/1480 5.00 4.64 4.68 4.64 5.00 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 836/1450 4.00 4.10 4.09 3.97 4.00 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 Ω Ω 1 4.50 762/1409 4.50 4.46 4.42 4.36 4.50 1 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 4.50 1107/1407 4.50 4.77 4.69 4.57 4.50 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1002/1399 4.00 4.30 4.26 4.23 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 1017/1400 4.00 4.35 4.27 4.19 4.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 894/1179 3.50 3.94 3.96 3.85 3.50 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. 0 0 0 0 0 4.00 708/1262 4.00 4.18 4.05 3.77 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 1094/1259 3.50 4.40 4.29 4.06 3.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 00 2 0 0 3.00 1167/1256 3.00 4.34 4.30 4.08 3.00 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 4.00 394/ 788 4.00 4.03 4.00 3.80 4.00 Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 50/ 55 3.00 3.90 4.55 4.48 3.00 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 30/ 31 3.50 4.28 4.75 4.42 3.50 2 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 47/ 51 3.50 4.42 4.65 4.63 3.50 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful 2 0 0 0 2 0 0 3.00 34/ 34 3.00 4.50 4.83 4.67 3.00 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 3.50 24/ 24 3.50 4.50 4.82 4.58 3.50

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

Course-Section: ELC 051 8030 University of Maryland Title JUN 13, 2006

ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA Baltimore County Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN Spring 2006

Enrollment: 10 Questionnaires: 4

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 597

Job IRBR3029

					Frequencies			Inst	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 yo	u gain n	ew insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.00
2. Did th	e instru	ctor make clear	the ex	spected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1205/1481	3.75	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.75
3. Did the	e exam q	uestions reflec	t the e	expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1046/1249	3.75	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.75
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.00
5. Did as	signed r	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	297/1396	4.50	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.50
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	542/1342	4.25	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.25
7. Was the	e gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How max	ny times	was class cand	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How wo	uld you	grade the overa	ll teac	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	546/1450	4.33	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.33
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.75	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.75
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1257/1407	4.25	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.25
3. Was le	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.50
4. Did the	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.25
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.75
2. Were a	ll stude	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1259	4.25	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.25
3. Did the	e instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.00
4. Were s	pecial to	echniques succe	ssful		0	0	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.50
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3			
00-27									or Ma			1	 Graduat		0	Majo		0
	8-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 1					кес	quir	eu I	OT IAIS	a JOE	5	т	Graduat	E	U	мајс)Τ	U
	56-83 0 2.00-2.99 0 C 0					Cor	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non	-major	0
	84-150 0 3.00-3.49 1 D 0					Gei	пета	1				U	onder-9	Lau	7	MOII-	ilia JUL	U
Grad.						ភ្ ា	ecti [.]	17AC				0	#### - 1	Meane +	here a	re not	enouc	rh
Ji au.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 0 F 0					11.1	CCLI	v C D				U	respons				_	1++
				I 0		O+1	her					2	T CBPOHB		c bran	cai		
				1 0			TTCT					4						

Course-Section: ELC 052 8011 University of Maryla Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA Baltimore County Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN (Instr. A) Spring 2006

University of Maryland Page 598
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6				
Questionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions							Fre	equer	ncies				ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		om this course	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.00
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.50
		estions reflec		_	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.50
	_	ations reflect			0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	502/1396	4.25	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.25
6. Did w	ritten ass	signments contr	ibute :	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.00
7. Was t	he grading	g system clearly	y expla	ained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1154/1459	3.75	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.75
8. How m	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How w	ould you g	grade the overa	ll tea	ching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	334/1450	4.50	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.50
1. Were	Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared							0	0	1	3	4.75	417/1409	4.88	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.88
2. Did t	he instruc	ctor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1107/1407	4.50	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.50
3. Was l	ecture mat	erial presente	d and	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	567/1399	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.50
4. Did t	he lecture	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	591/1400	4.50	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.50
5. Did a	udiovisual	l techniques en	hance :	your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.94	3.96	3.85	4.25
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu	assions contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.75
2. Were	all studer	nts actively en	courage	ed to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1094/1259	3.50	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.50
3. Did t	he instruc	ctor encourage	fair a	nd open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1042/1256	3.75	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.75
4. Were	4. Were special techniques successful						0	0	1	1	2	4.25	291/ 788	4.25	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.25
	Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	1												
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	2			Ty	ne			Majors	
																		, . – – – –
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	5	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 0		_							1					
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	4	Non-	major	0

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	1	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	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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	nificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				2	0						

Course-Section: ELC 052 8011 University of Maryland Page 599 ESL:ADV READING & VOCA Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006

Title Instructor: (Instr. C) Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	6				
Ouestionnaires:	4	Student	Course	Evaluation	Ouestionnaire

	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	2	0	2	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	517/1481	4.50	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	502/1396	4.25	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1154/1459	3.75	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	205/1262	4.75	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1094/1259	3.50	4.40	4.29	4.06	3.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1042/1256	3.75	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	291/ 788	4.25	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.25

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	4	Required for Majors	1	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	4	Non-major	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0	Electives		responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	Λ						

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010 University of Maryland Page 600 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Instructor: CHINNERY, GEORG Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 1

Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre		cies				uctor	Course	Dept		Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean

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

Course-Section: ELC 071 8010 University of Maryland Page 601 Title ADV ACADEMIC DISCOURSE Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1451/1481	3.00	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1420/1481	3.00	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	893/1249	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	3.89	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	3.88	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1380/1459	3.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1354/1450	3.00	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.00
T - wh														
Lecture	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 00	1152/1409	4.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.57	4.00 5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	-	0	0	0	0	1	0		1002/1399	4.00	4.77	4.69	4.23	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0		1002/1399	4.00	4.30	4.25	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	U	U	U	U	U	Т	U	4.00	101//1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									

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

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010 University of Maryland ADV ORAL PRESENTATION Baltimore County

Page 602 Title JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Instructor: CHINNERY, GEORG Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	1	
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

		Frequencies				Instructor		Course Dept		UMBC Level		Sect		
Questions		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	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.14	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.18	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.17	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.57	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1399	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.23	5.00
. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.19	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding			0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	3.85	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.00
Fram	ı an atı	. Diat	-rih	1+ i 01	n									

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