Course-Section: ELC 041 8010

ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR

Title

Instructor: DRAGANESCU, MAR

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 641 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student C	ourse	Eval	Luation	Que	st	Lon	ına:	ır	е
-----------	-------	------	---------	-----	----	-----	------	----	---

				Fre	quer	cies	\$		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	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
	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
	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	2			972/1342	4.00	4.84	4.32	4.19	4.00
	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	7	0	0	1	0	3	_		1232/1520	3.80		4.25	4.19	3.80
	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	3			1067/1465	3.80		4.12	4.02	3.80
	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	3	1		1172/1434	3.60	4.62	4.14	3.94	3.60
	Was the grading system clearly explained	7	0	0	2	1	0			1380/1547	3.40	4.63		4.10	3.40
	How many times was class cancelled	7	0	0	0	0	2	3		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
	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
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	2		4.20	997/1489	4.20	4.87		4.22	4.20
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	2	1	0	1		1230/1277	2.60	4.28	4.03	3.91	2.60
٥.	bia additivibual ecciniiques chiance your understanding	,	O	_	2	_	O	_	2.00	1230/12//	2.00	1.20	1.05	3.71	2.00
	Discussion														
1		0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4 00	000/1070	4 00	4 40	1 17	2 06	4 00
	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
	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
	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	****
	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	****
	Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 79	****	4.83	4.69	4.52	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 72	****	4.77	4.64	4.43	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 80	****	4.80	4.61	4.55	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 375	****	4.76	4.01	3.78	****
э.	were criteria for grading made clear	10	U	Т	U	U	U	Τ	3.00	****/ 3/5	* * * *	4.76	4.01	3.78	
_	Field Work			_	_	_	_	_							
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 52	****	4.57	4.48	4.20	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.51	4.40	4.11	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 44	****	4.87	4.73	4.71	****
	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	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****
	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.89	4.67	4.68	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 28	****	4.81	4.78	4.65	****
	Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 382	****	4.86	4.08	3.86	****
٦.	mere energy proceeds for all the betweenes		J	_	U	U	U	U	1.00	, 302		1.00	1.00	5.00	

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

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1	_			
				?	0						

Course-Section	: ELC 043 8010	University of Maryland	Page 642
Title	ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI	Baltimore County	JUL 2, 2009
Instructor:	MUNDY, SUSAN E	Spring 2009	Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MUNDY, SUSAN E
Enrollment: 2 Spring 2009

Furoriment.	2	
Questionnaires:	2	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	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

Credits E	arned	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	1
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 043 8011 University of Maryland ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI Baltimore County

Ρ

I

0

Title Spring 2009 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA

Enrollment:	3			
Questionnaires:	3	Student Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

							Fr	equer	ncies	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 I															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1148/1576	4.50	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.00
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1576		4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00
		estions reflect			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342		4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00
	_	uations reflect		1 5	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1520		4.78	4.25	4.09	5.00
				what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1242/1465		4.51	4.12	4.02	3.50
	_	-		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
		system clearly			1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1041/1547	4.50	4.63	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How m	nany times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.67	4.64	4.59	5.00
9. How w	ould you	grade the overal	ll tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	395/1554	4.25	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.50
		T o eth	_															
1 Were	the instri	Lecture actor's lectures		nrenared	1	0	0	0	Λ	0	2	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.85	4.47	4.41	5.00
		ctor seem intere			1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.93	4.73	4.65	5.00
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1486		4.83	4.32	4.26	5.00
		es contribute to			1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1489	5.00	4.87	4.32	4.22	5.00
				your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1107	5.00	4.28	4.03	3.91	5.00
		1		,									•					
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did c	lass disc	ussions contribu	ite 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 studer	nts actively end	courage	ed 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 t	he instru	ctor encourage f	fair ar	nd 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 te	echniques succes	ssful		1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.69	4.05	3.91	4.50
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 1		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajors	;	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1														
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t		re not	enoug	h

Other

Page 643 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010

ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA

Title

Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 17

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 644 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NΔ	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	4	0	0	0	3	7	3		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		4.12	4.02	4.15
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	5	6 8	4.31	625/1434	4.31	4.62	4.14	3.94	4.31
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled	4 4	0	0	0	1	5 6	8 6	4.62	399/1547 1219/1574	4.62 4.69	4.63 4.67	4.19 4.64	4.10 4.59	4.62 4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.38	263/1554		4.67	4.04	4.59	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	,		U	U	U	3	0	4.07	203/1554	4.07	4.30	4.10	4.01	4.07
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	10	0	0	0	2	1	1	2 (0	00/ 05	2 (0	1 77	4 70	4 50	2 (0
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12 12	0	0	0 0	3 2	1 1	1 2	3.60 4.00	82/ 85 67/ 79	3.60 4.00	4.77 4.83	4.72 4.69	4.52 4.52	3.60 4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	3	1	1		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
or note official for grading made officer		Ü	ŭ	Ü	J	Ü	_	3.00	17.7 3.3	3.00	1.70	1.01	3.70	3.00
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		****/ 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		****/ 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 17

Enrollment: Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 644 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	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	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	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		_	
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 051 8011 University of Maryland Page 645 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009

Instructor: MUNDY, SUSAN E

Enrollment: 12 Questionnaires: 12

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Job IRBR3029

							Fre	eque	ncies	5		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 Did 100	u gain n	Genera ew insights,ski	_	m this sourse	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4 00	1148/1576	4.00	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.00	
_	_	ew insignes,ski ctor make clear			9	0	0	1	0	0	2		1138/1576	4.00	4.79	4.27	4.11	4.00	
		uestions reflec			9	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/1342		4.79	4.32	4.19	****	
	_	uations reflect		1 3	٥	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520		4.78	4.25	4.19	5.00	
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1465	4.58	4.51	4.12	4.02	5.00	
	_	-		o what you learned	9	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/1434		4.62	4.14	3.94	****	
		g system clearl		-	9	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/1547	4.62	4.62	4.19	4.10	****	
		J 1		arned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574			4.19	4.10	5.00	
		was class canc			-	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1554		4.67	4.04		****	
9. HOW WO	oura you	grade the overa	II tead	ching effectiveness	10	U	U	U	U	U	2	5.00	^^^^/1554	4.67	4.38	4.10	4.01		
		Lectur	е																
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1488	4.69	4.85	4.47	4.41	****	
		ctor seem inter			11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1493	4.77	4.93	4.73	4.65	****	
				explained clearly	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1486	4.77	4.83	4.32	4.26	****	
		es contribute t			11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1489	4.77	4.87	4.32	4.22	****	
				your understanding	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1277	3.92		4.03	3.91	****	
1 1 -1		Discus			0	0	0	0	•	•	2	F 00	1 /1 000	4 55	4 40	4 1 1	2 06	F 00	
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1279	4.55	4.48	4.17	3.96	5.00	
		_	_	ed to participate	9	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	928/1270	4.27	4.63	4.35	4.09	4.00	
				nd 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 s	special to	echniques succe	ssiul		9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	164/ 878	4.47	4.69	4.05	3.91	4.67	
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	utio	n										
a 1'. =	. 1	a ana						_					_						
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	; 			Ту	pe 			Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jors	5	0	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0	
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 1			-			-									
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	-major	12	
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0													-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ŗh	
	P 0			P 0												significant			
						1						_	I 3						

Other

1

I

0

0

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

EDMONDS, LORI M (Instr. A)

Instructor:

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 646

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			17		naic	~		Twat	- 2011 at a 20	001170-	Dont	TIMDO	T 0770 7	C.
Questions	NR	NA	1	-	ncie: 3	3 4	5	Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Mean		Level Mean	
 General														
. 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
. 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.
. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342			4.32	4.19	5
. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1520	5.00		4.25	4.09	
Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67		4.67		4.12	4.02	
Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434			4.14	3.94	
Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1547		4.63		4.10	
How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	1		1262/1574			4.64	4.59	
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
Lecture														
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
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	į
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	
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	
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	
Discussion														
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	
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	
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	
Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	
Seminar														
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	
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	
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	
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	
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	
Field Work														
Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 52			4.48	4.20	
Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 48	5.00		4.40	4.11	
Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 44				4.71	
To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57	4.72	
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	
Self Paced	_	_	_	_	_	_	_							
Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.70	4.60	4.44	
Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 24		5.00	4.83	4.71	
Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 35	5.00		4.67	4.68	
Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 28	5.00	4.81	4.78	4.65	
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	
Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	S

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		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	В	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	ı	

0 responses to be significant 0 Other 1 0

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

Baltimore County (Instr. B) Spring 2009

? 0

Instructor: Enrollment: 3

Questionnaires: 3

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 647

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

_																	
						Fr	eque	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			•		•		_	_	4 00	064 /4556	4 00		4 00		4 00
			s from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576		4.37	4.30		4.33
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576		4.79	4.27	4.18	5.00
	_		the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342		4.84	4.32	4.19	5.00
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	5.00 4.67	1/1520 264/1465		4.78 4.51	4.25 4.12	4.09	4.67
	_		oute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1434		4.62	4.14	4.02 3.94	5.00
		g system clearly	_	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1434		4.62	4.14	4.10	5.00
	-	was class cancel	-	0	0	0	0	0	2	1		1262/1574		4.67			4.33
	-		l teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554			4.10		4.17
		5		_	-	_		-	_	_		,					
	_	Lecture								_							
			what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1489		4.87	4.32	4.22	5.00
5. Did au	ıdiovisua.	l techniques enha	ance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.92	4.28	4.03	3.91	4.92
		Discussi	ion														
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribut	te 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 a	all stude	nts actively enco	ouraged 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 th	ne instru	ctor encourage fa	air 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 s	special te	echniques success	sful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	5.00
		Seminar															
1 Were a	accioned t		the announced theme	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.52	5.00
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Was the instructor available for individual attention				0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79		4.83	4.72	4.52	5.00
			te to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 72		4.77	4.64		5.00
	_		what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 80		4.80		4.55	5.00
_		for grading made	-	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375		4.76		3.78	5.00
1 Did fi	ald arms	Field Wo	ork e 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
	_		e to what you learned e evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 48		4.57	4.40	4.20	5.00
_		ctor available fo		2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 44		4.87		4.71	
			ss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 45		5.00	4.73	4.72	5.00
	_	-	out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 326		4.89			5.00
		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1															
1 541	16	Self Pa		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	F 00	1 / 40	F 00	4 70	4 60	4 44	F 00
	_	_	te to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 40		4.70	4.60	4.44	5.00
			the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 24		5.00	4.83	4.71	5.00
_		acts with the ins	_	2	0 0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 35		4.89	4.67		5.00
		ck/tutoring by programs for	all the students	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28 1/ 382		4.81 4.86	4.78 4.08	4.65 3.86	5.00 5.00
J. NCIC C	incre eno	agii proceeds for	arr the betateres	_	Ü	J	Ü	Ü	Ü	_	3.00	1, 302	3.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	3.00
	Fre					trib	utio	n									
	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade						Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	5
	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 2				Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 s	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55						_	_	-	J ·						5		-
56-83					Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	3
84-150																	
Grad.					Ele	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	: enoug	jh
			P 0					re			respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt		
			I 0		Ot1	her					1						

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

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 648

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

(Instr. C)

Instructor:

	Overal i an a		MD	377	Fre	_	ncies 3	3	_		tructor	Course	_		Level	Se
	Questions 			NA 				- -		Mean	Rank 		Mean	меан	Mean	M∈
	General															
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		0	0	0	0	0	2	1		861/1576		4.37	4.30	4.11	
	Tou gain new insights, skills from this count the instructor make clear the expected goat the exam questions reflect the expected goat the exam questions reflect the expected goat the exam questions reflect the expected goat sisigned readings contribute to what you insitten assignments contribute to what you he grading system clearly explained any times was class cancelled rould you grade the overall teaching effect the lectures contribute to what you learned and it is a contribute to what you learned and successful the contribute to what you had successful techniques successful Seminar assigned topics relevant to the announced the instructor available for individual at research projects contribute to what you he resentations contribute to what you learned the contribute to what you learned the instructor available for consultation contribute to available for consultation and degree could you discuss your evaluation contribute degree could you discuss your evaluation contribute to what you learned the instructor available for consultation and degree could you discuss your evaluation contribute to what you learned the instructor available for consultation and degree could you discuss your evaluation contribute to what you learned the contribute to what you learned the process help you carry out field active the contribute to what you learned the contribute t		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576		4.79	4.27	4.18	5.
			0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342		4.84	4.32	4.19	5
		•	0	0	0	0	0	0 1	3 2		1/1520		4.78	4.25	4.09	5
_										4.67	264/1465	4.67	4.51	4.12	4.02	4
	-	you rearned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1434		4.62	4.14	3.94	5 5
_			0	0	0	0	0	2			1/1547 1262/1574		4.63 4.67	4.19	4.10 4.59	
_		fectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554			4.10	4.01	
	Lecture															
Did the l		rned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.87	4.32	4.22	5
			2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1277	4.92	4.28	4.03	3.91	
	Discussion															
Did class	s discussions contribute to what you	ı learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.48	4.17	3.96	4
Were all	students actively encouraged to par	rticipate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.63	4.35	4.09	5
		discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.79	4.35	4.09	5
Were spec	cial techniques successful		1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	Ę
			2	0												
	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced the				0	0	0	0	1		1/ 85	5.00	4.77	4.72	4.52	5
		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.83	4.69	4.52	į	
		2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 72		4.77	4.64		į	
_	_	arned	2	0	0	0	0 0	0	1 1		1/ 80 1/ 375		4.80 4.76	4.61 4.01	4.55 3.78	
	Field Work															
Did field		learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 52	5.00	4.57	4.48	4.20	5
	-		2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 48		4.51	4.40	4.11	5
_			2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 44		4.87	4.73	4.71	
			2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 45	5.00	5.00	4.57		-
			2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 326		4.89	4.03		
	Self Paced															
Did self-	paced system contribute to what you	ı learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 40	5.00	4.70	4.60	4.44	Ę
Did study	questions make clear the expected	goal	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24		5.00	4.83	4.71	Ę
Were your	contacts with the instructor helpf	Eul	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.68	Ę
			2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 28	5.00	4.81	4.78	4.65	Ę
Were ther	ents	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.86	4.08	3.86	Ę	
	Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	ution	n										
edits Earn	ned Cum. GPA Expec	cted Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	3
				Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	 S	1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	or	
				a		1				٥	TTm day		2	Mar		
				Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	
				m1 ·	- 4 ± -					1	шшти.	Moore +	hore -			~h
rad.	0 3.50-4.00 1 F			ETE	ectiv	/es				1	#### -				_	111
	I I			∩ +¹	2072					1	responses to be signific			ıııcar	IL	
	L U	Other 1				т.										

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010 University of Maryland Title JUL 2, 2009

Page 649

Job IRBR3029

ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN Baltimore County (Instr. D) Spring 2009

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

			NR	NA	Fro	_	ncies 3	5 4	5		tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mear	
		 General															. – – – –
1 Did vo	u gain n	ew insights,skills from	this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	861/1576	4 33	4.37	4.30	4.11	4.3
_	-	ctor make clear the expe		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576		4.79	4.27	4.18	5.0
		uestions reflect the exp		0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1342		4.84	4.32	4.19	5.0
		uations reflect the expe		0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520		4.78	4.25	4.09	5.0
		eadings contribute to wh	-	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67			4.51	4.12	4.02	4.6
		signments contribute to		0	0	0	0	0	0	3		1/1434		4.62	4.14	3.94	5.0
		g system clearly explain		0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1547		4.63	4.19	4.10	5.0
	-	was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	2			1262/1574		4.67			4.3
	_	grade the overall teachi	ng effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	924/1554	4.17	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.1
		Lecture															
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques enhance you	r understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	4.92	4.28	4.03	3.91	4.9
		Discussion															
L. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contribute to wh	at you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.48	4.17	3.96	4.5
		nts actively encouraged		1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.63	4.35	4.09	5.0
		ctor encourage fair and	open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1269		4.79	4.35		5.0
l. Were s	pecial to	echniques successful		1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.69	4.05	3.91	5.0
		Seminar															
		topics relevant to the a		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 85		4.77	4.72	4.52	5.0
		ctor available for indiv		2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 79		4.83	4.69	4.52	5.0
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned Did presentations contribute to what you learned				0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 72		4.77	4.64		5.0
					0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 80		4.80	4.61		
b. Were c	riteria	for grading made clear		2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.0
1 1 1		Field Work			0	0	•	0	•	-	F 00	1 / 50	F 00	4 55	4 40	4 00	- 0
		rience contribute to wha		2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 52		4.57	4.48	4.20	5.0
		y understand your evalua ctor available for consu		2	0 0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48 1/ 44		4.51	4.40	4.11	5.0
				2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 44 1/ 45		4.87 5.00	4.73 4.57	4.71 4.72	5.0
		could you discuss your s help you carry out fie		2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 45		4.89	4.57		5.0
o. Dia co.	illerence:	s help you cally out lie	id activities	4	U	U	U	U	U	1	3.00	1/ 320	5.00	4.09	4.03	3.04	5.0
		Self Paced			•					_				4 50	4		
		system contribute to wh		2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 40		4.70	4.60	4.44	5.0
		tions make clear the exp	-	2	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/ 24		5.00	4.83	4.71	5.0
_		acts with the instructor	-	2	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/ 35		4.89	4.67	4.68	5.0
		ck/tutoring by proctors		2	0 0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 28 1/ 382		4.81	4.78	4.65 3.86	
	Were there enough proctors for all the students				o Dist							_,					
Credits E 							Re	asons	5 			Ту 	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27					Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	3	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83					Gei	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	3	Non-	-major	3
84-150												3				5	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 1 F 0					Ele	ecti [.]	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ſh
			P 0									respons					
			I 0	Other						1							
1 0						Other											

Course-Section: ELC 071 8010

ESL TOP III: WRT FR RE

Title FOLLETT, SONJA

Instructor: Enrollment:

5 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 650 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	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	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		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: FOLLET

Enrollment: 5
Questionnaires: 5

FOLLETT, SONJA

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 650 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	3	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	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	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				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

			Fre	equer	cies	5		Insti	ructor	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	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		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		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		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		5.00	1/1269	5.00		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		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		5.00	1/ 72	5.00	4.77		4.43	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		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	Τ	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.76	4.01	3.78	5.00
m! 11 ··· 1														
Field Work	•	0	0	•	0	_	-	F 00	1 / 50	F 00	4 55	4 40	4 00	F 00
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		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		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		5.00	1/ 45	5.00		4.57	4.72	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.89	4.03	3.64	5.00
Calf Danid														
Self Paced	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	1 / 40	г оо	4 70	1 60	1 11	г оо
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		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 1/ 28	5.00	4.89	4.67	4.68	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	U	U	U	U	U	U	Τ	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	4.81	4./8	4.65	5.00

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010

Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION

Instructor:

Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

Baltimore County VALAIS, TERESA Spring 2009

Page 651 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	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	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	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0	_			
				?	0						