

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: DRAGANESCU, MAR
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 641
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	7	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	996/1576	4.20	4.79	4.27	4.18	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1232/1520	3.80	4.78	4.25	4.09	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3	1	3.80	1067/1465	3.80	4.51	4.12	4.02	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1172/1434	3.60	4.62	4.14	3.94	3.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	2	1	0	2	3.40	1380/1547	3.40	4.63	4.19	4.10	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1003/1574	4.60	4.67	4.64	4.59	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.85	4.47	4.41	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	7	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.83	4.32	4.26	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.87	4.32	4.22	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	1230/1277	2.60	4.28	4.03	3.91	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.48	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	827/1270	4.25	4.63	4.35	4.09	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	819/1269	4.25	4.79	4.35	4.09	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	709/ 878	3.50	4.69	4.05	3.91	3.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	4.50	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.17	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	4.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	4.20	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	3.67	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 85	****	4.77	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.83	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 72	****	4.77	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.80	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	4.57	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.51	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 44	****	4.87	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 326	****	4.89	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 40	****	4.70	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.89	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	4.81	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 382	****	4.86	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: DRAGANESCU, MAR
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 641
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 043 8010
 Title ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI
 Instructor: MUNDY, SUSAN E
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 642
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	4.50	4.37	4.30	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.78	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	4.25	4.51	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	4.25	4.62	4.14	3.94	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	4.50	4.63	4.19	4.10	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.25	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 043 8011
 Title ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 643
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.50	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.78	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1242/1465	4.25	4.51	4.12	4.02	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1204/1434	4.25	4.62	4.14	3.94	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.50	4.63	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.25	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.85	4.47	4.41	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.65	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.83	4.32	4.26	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.87	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.28	4.03	3.91	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.48	4.17	3.96	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	928/1270	4.00	4.63	4.35	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.09	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.69	4.05	3.91	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 1	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 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 3 Non-major 3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 644
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	4	0	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	668/1576	4.23	4.79	4.27	4.18	4.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	696/1342	4.42	4.84	4.32	4.19	4.42	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	880/1520	4.62	4.78	4.25	4.09	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	748/1465	4.58	4.51	4.12	4.02	4.15	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	625/1434	4.31	4.62	4.14	3.94	4.31	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	399/1547	4.62	4.63	4.19	4.10	4.62	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	1219/1574	4.69	4.67	4.64	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	263/1554	4.67	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	624/1488	4.69	4.85	4.47	4.41	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	888/1493	4.77	4.93	4.73	4.65	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	325/1486	4.77	4.83	4.32	4.26	4.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	364/1489	4.77	4.87	4.32	4.22	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	3	3	5	3.92	791/1277	3.92	4.28	4.03	3.91	3.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	774/1279	4.55	4.48	4.17	3.96	4.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	605/1270	4.27	4.63	4.35	4.09	4.55	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	559/1269	4.32	4.79	4.35	4.09	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	355/ 878	4.47	4.69	4.05	3.91	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	157/ 234	4.00	4.50	4.23	4.08	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	213/ 240	3.83	4.17	4.35	4.29	3.83	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	203/ 229	4.00	4.50	4.51	4.43	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	1	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	151/ 232	4.20	4.20	4.29	4.27	4.20	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	11	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	355/ 379	3.67	3.67	4.20	4.15	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	82/ 85	3.60	4.77	4.72	4.52	3.60	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	67/ 79	4.00	4.83	4.69	4.52	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	70/ 72	3.60	4.77	4.64	4.43	3.60	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	75/ 80	3.80	4.80	4.61	4.55	3.80	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	3	0	2	3.80	197/ 375	3.80	4.76	4.01	3.78	3.80	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	40/ 52	4.00	4.57	4.48	4.20	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	41/ 48	3.60	4.51	4.40	4.11	3.60	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	38/ 44	4.20	4.87	4.73	4.71	4.20	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	1	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	153/ 326	4.33	4.89	4.03	3.64	4.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	33/ 40	4.20	4.70	4.60	4.44	4.20	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	30/ 35	4.20	4.89	4.67	4.68	4.20	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	25/ 28	4.20	4.81	4.78	4.65	4.20	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	183/ 382	4.17	4.86	4.08	3.86	4.17	

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 644
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 051 8011
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: MUNDY, SUSAN E
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 645
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1138/1576	4.23	4.79	4.27	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1342	4.42	4.84	4.32	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	4.62	4.78	4.25	4.09	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	4.58	4.51	4.12	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1434	4.31	4.62	4.14	3.94	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1547	4.62	4.63	4.19	4.10	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1574	4.69	4.67	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1554	4.67	4.38	4.10	4.01	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1488	4.69	4.85	4.47	4.41	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1493	4.77	4.93	4.73	4.65	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	4.77	4.83	4.32	4.26	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	4.77	4.87	4.32	4.22	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	3.92	4.28	4.03	3.91	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	4.55	4.48	4.17	3.96	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	928/1270	4.27	4.63	4.35	4.09	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	928/1269	4.32	4.79	4.35	4.09	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.47	4.69	4.05	3.91	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 0	Graduate 0 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 12 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: EDMONDS, LORI M (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 646
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.78	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.51	4.12	4.02	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.63	4.19	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.67	4.64	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	263/1554	4.17	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.85	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.83	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.87	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	215/1277	4.92	4.28	4.03	3.91	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.48	4.17	3.96	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.63	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.52	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.52	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.80	4.61	4.55	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.57	4.48	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.11	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.72	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.89	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.70	4.60	4.44	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.71	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.68	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.81	4.78	4.65	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.86	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	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 1	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 1	#### - Means there are not enough	

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	1	
?	0			

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 647
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.78	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.51	4.12	4.02	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.63	4.19	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.67	4.64	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.17	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.87	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.92	4.28	4.03	3.91	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.48	4.17	3.96	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.63	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.52	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.52	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.80	4.61	4.55	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.57	4.48	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.11	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.72	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.89	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.70	4.60	4.44	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.71	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.68	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.81	4.78	4.65	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.86	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	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 1	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 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 648
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.78	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.51	4.12	4.02	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.63	4.19	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.67	4.64	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.17	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.87	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.92	4.28	4.03	3.91	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.48	4.17	3.96	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.63	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.52	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.52	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.80	4.61	4.55	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.57	4.48	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.11	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.72	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.89	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.70	4.60	4.44	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.71	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.68	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.81	4.78	4.65	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.86	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	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 1	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 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 649
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4.33	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.78	4.25	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.51	4.12	4.02	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.63	4.19	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.67	4.64	4.59	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.17	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.17	
Lecture															
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.92	4.28	4.03	3.91	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.48	4.17	3.96	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.63	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.52	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.52	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.80	4.61	4.55	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.57	4.48	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.11	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.72	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.89	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.70	4.60	4.44	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.71	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.68	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.81	4.78	4.65	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.86	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	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 1	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 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: ELC 071 8010
 Title ESL TOP III: WRT FR RE
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 650
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	301/1576	4.75	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.78	4.25	4.09	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.51	4.12	4.02	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	193/1434	4.75	4.62	4.14	3.94	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	838/1547	4.25	4.63	4.19	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.85	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.83	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.87	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	1252/1277	2.33	4.28	4.03	3.91	2.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	262/1279	4.75	4.48	4.17	3.96	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.63	4.35	4.09	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	4.50	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	221/ 240	3.67	4.17	4.35	4.29	3.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	4.50	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	4.20	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	3.67	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.80	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	152/ 375	4.50	4.76	4.01	3.78	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	46/ 52	3.00	4.57	4.48	4.20	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	43/ 48	3.00	4.51	4.40	4.11	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.87	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.89	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	36/ 40	3.67	4.70	4.60	4.44	3.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.71	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.68	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 28	4.50	4.81	4.78	4.65	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.86	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Course-Section: ELC 071 8010
 Title ESL TOP III: WRT FR RE
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 650
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	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	2	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	3	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: VALAIS, TERESA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 651
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.37	4.30	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.51	4.12	4.02	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1434	5.00	4.62	4.14	3.94	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.63	4.19	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.38	4.10	4.01	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.85	4.47	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.83	4.32	4.26	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.87	4.32	4.22	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.28	4.03	3.91	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.48	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.63	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 234	5.00	4.50	4.23	4.08	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 240	5.00	4.17	4.35	4.29	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 229	5.00	4.50	4.51	4.43	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.52	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.52	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.77	4.64	4.43	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.80	4.61	4.55	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.57	4.48	4.20	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.51	4.40	4.11	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.87	4.73	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.72	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.89	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.70	4.60	4.44	5.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	5.00	4.83	4.71	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.68	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.81	4.78	4.65	5.00	

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: VALAIS, TERESA
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 651
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	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	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						