Course-Section: ELC 041 8010 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 13 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 595 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1504	* * * *	4.24	4.27	4.13	* * * *
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1503	* * * *	4.22	4.20	4.16	* * * *
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1290	* * * *	4.32	4.28	4.19	* * * *
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1453	* * * *	4.22	4.21	4.11	* * * *
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1421	* * * *	4.08	4.00	3.91	* * * *
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1365	* * * *	4.11	4.08	3.96	* * * *
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1485	* * * *	4.20	4.16	4.13	* * * *
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1504	* * * *	4.68	4.69	4.66	* * * *
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1483	* * * *	4.07	4.06	3.97	* * * *
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	* * * *	4.41	4.41	4.36	* * * *
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1426	* * * *	4.72	4.69	4.56	* * * *
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1418	* * * *	4.29	4.25	4.20	* * * *
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1416		4.34	4.26	4.21	* * * *
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/1199		3.95	3.97	3.82	* * * *
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1312	* * * *	4.12	4.00	3.69	* * * *
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1303	* * * *	4.39	4.24	3.93	* * * *
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	* * * *	4.34	4.25	3.94	* * * *
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 758	* * * *	4.05	4.01	3.80	* * * *

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons	Туре	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	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	0	General	0	Under-grad 1	13	Non-major	11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### – Means t	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to b	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 043 8010 Title ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI Instructor: Valais, Teresa Enrollment: 1 Questionnaires: 1

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 596 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504		4.24	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 1		1/1453 1/1421	5.00 5.00	4.22 4.08	4.21 4.00	4.11 3.91	5.00 5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0 0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	3.91	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1305	5.00	4.20	4.08	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.07	4.06	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	3.82	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	3.80	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.07	4.09	3.90	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 244	5.00	4.12	4.09	4.07	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.49	4.40	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.40	4.23	4.01	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.01	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.60	4.61	4.64	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.54	4.35	4.43	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	3.88	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.41	4.44	4.51	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.17	4.17	3.83	5.00
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.12	4.23	4.11	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.68	4.65	4.60	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.32	4.29	4.00	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.61	4.44	5.00	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 40	4.00	4.28	4.53	4.52	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.43	4.49	4.65	5.00

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	36	5.00	4.38	4.60	4.48	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	20	5.00	5.00	4.24	4.92	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	16	5.00	5.00	4.51	5.00	5.00

Course-Section:	: ELC 043 8	010	Universi	ty of Maryland		Page 596
Title	ESL:SPEAKIN	G & LISTENI	Balti	more County		JUN 14, 2005
Instructor:	Valais, Ter	esa	Sp	oring 2005		Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:	1					
Questionnaires	: 1		Student Course E	valuation Questionnaire		
			Frequency	Distribution		
			r requeite,			
Credits Earned	Cum	. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Туре	Majors

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	7	Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	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	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 597 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

## Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ouestions N			Fre 1	equer 2	ncies	5	F		ructor	Course Mean	-		Level	Sect
Questions	NR 	NA 	⊥ 		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	3	3	4.50	549/1504	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	751/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	711/1290	3.92	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1148/1453	4.17	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	479/1421	4.29	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	493/1365	4.17	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	990/1485	3.75	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
T o shuuo														
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	C	4	4.67	572/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2 1	7		1197/1426	4.57	4.72	4.41	4.56	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	1		1013/1418	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	806/1416	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	495/1199	4.50	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.25
······································	-	_	-	-	-	-	_							
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	3.83	1020/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	570/1299	4.38	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	б	0	4.00	387/ 758	3.88	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.00
- 1 · · ·														
Laboratory	г	0	0	0	0	1	0	4 0 0	****/ 233	* * * *	4 07	4 0 0	2 00	* * * *
<ol> <li>Did the lab increase understanding of the material</li> <li>Were you provided with adequate background information</li> </ol>	5 5	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 1	0		****/ 244	****	$4.07 \\ 4.12$	4.09 4.09	3.90 4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5 5	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 227	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 225	* * * *	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 207	* * * *	4.22	4.09	4.01	* * * *
5. Here requirements for tab reports crearry specifica	5	U	U	U	U	U	-	5.00	, 207		1.22	1.00	1.01	
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	* * * *	4.61	4.44	5.00	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons	Туре	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	1
				Р	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 051 8011 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 7

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 598 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	3 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-	UMBC Mean		
General	-			•	-	-	~	4 05	000/1504			4 0 7	4 1 0	4 05
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	1		1052/1503		4.22	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0 0	1 0	0 0	0 1	∠ 0	1 3		1155/1290 440/1453	3.92 4.17	4.32 4.22	4.28	4.19 4.11	3.50 4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	548/1421	4.17	4.22	4.21 4.00	4.11 3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	3		782/1365	4.17	4.11	4.08	3.91	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	0	0	2		1284/1485	3.75	4.20	4.16		3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	4		1/1504		4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	0	0		****/1483		4.07		3.97	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1418	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.50	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.29	4.39		3.93	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	798/1299	4.38	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	508/ 758	3.88	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.07	4.09	3.90	* * * *
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 244	* * * *	4.12	4.09	4.07	* * * *
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	* * * *	4.49	4.40	4.24	* * * *
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	* * * *	4.40	4.23	4.01	* * * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	б	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	* * * *	4.22	4.09	4.01	* * * *
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	* * * *	4.60	4.61	4.64	* * * *
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	* * * *	4.54	4.35	4.43	* * * *
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	* * * *	4.32	4.34	3.88	* * * *
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	* * * *	4.41	4.44	4.51	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	* * * *	4.17	4.17	3.83	* * * *
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 58					
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	* * * *	4.12	4.23	4.11	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	* * * *	4.68	4.65	4.60	* * * *
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 47	* * * *		4.29		* * * *
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	б	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	* * * *	4.61	4.44	5.00	* * * *
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	* * * *	4.28	4.53	4.52	* * * *

2. D	Did	study	questions	make	clear	the	expected	goal
------	-----	-------	-----------	------	-------	-----	----------	------

- 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful
- Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful
   Were there enough proctors for all the students

6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	35	* * * *	4.43	4.49	4.65	* * * *
б	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00 ****/	36	* * * *	4.38	4.60	4.48	* * * *
б	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00 ****/	20	* * * *	5.00	4.24	4.92	* * * *
6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00 ****/	16	* * * *	5.00	4.51	5.00	* * * *

Course-Section: ELC 051 8011	University of Maryland	Page 598
Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA	Baltimore County	JUN 14, 2005
Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE	Spring 2005	Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 9		
Questionnaires: 7	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	
	Frequency Distribution	

Credits Ea	edits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Туре	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	4		-		
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 052 8010 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T Enrollment: 7 Questionnaires: 7

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 599 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

# Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Frequencies					Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1010/1504	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	816/1503	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	866/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1136/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	479/1421	4.47	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	690/1365	4.37	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1200/1485	4.06	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	850/1483	4.30	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	876/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1183/1426	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	818/1418	4.54	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	961/1416	4.47	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1153/1199	3.60	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0 0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	572/1312		4.12	4.00	3.69	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1059/1303	3.96	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful			0	0	0	5	1	4.17	343/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.17

Credits Earned Cum. GPA			Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Туре	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	В	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	С	3	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 052 8011 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE Enrollment: 9 Questionnaires: 9

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 600 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

#### Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

General         1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course       4       0       0       1       0       1       3       4.20       962/1504       4.17       4.24       4.27       4.13       4.20         2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       4       0       1       0       1       3       4.20       962/1504       4.17       4.24       4.27       4.13       4.20         3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals       4       0       1       0       1       3       4.00       107/1290       4.07       4.32       4.28       4.19       4.00         4       0       0       0       2       3.80       1168/1453       3.83       4.22       4.21       4.11       3.80         6       Did written assignments contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       23/1365       4.37       4.11       4.08       3.96       4.60         7       Nas the grading contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.46       5.00         9       How would you grade the						ncies	3			ructor	Course	-	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. Did you gain new insight skills from this course       4       0       0       1       0       1       3       4.00       962/1504       4.17       4.22       4.27       4.13       4.20         2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       4       0       1       0       1       3       4.00       1052/1503       4.14       4.22       4.24       4.16       4.00         3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals       4       0       1       0       2       4.00       937/1290       4.07       4.33       4.24       4.11       4.16       4.00         4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       237/1230       4.07       4.13       4.22       4.21       4.11       3.80         5. Did assigner readings contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       237/1431       4.07       4.08       4.60       5.00         6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.01       4.16       4.60       5.00         9. How would you grade the ove	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. Did you gain new insight skills from this course       4       0       0       1       0       1       3       4.00       962/1504       4.17       4.22       4.27       4.13       4.20         2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       4       0       1       0       1       3       4.00       1052/1503       4.14       4.22       4.24       4.16       4.00         3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals       4       0       1       0       2       4.00       937/1290       4.07       4.33       4.24       4.11       4.16       4.00         4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       237/1230       4.07       4.13       4.22       4.21       4.11       3.80         5. Did assigner readings contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       237/1431       4.07       4.08       4.60       5.00         6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.01       4.16       4.60       5.00         9. How would you grade the ove	 General														
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals       4       0       1       0       0       1       3       4.00       1052/1503       4.14       4.22       4.20       4.16       4.00         3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals       4       0       0       1       0       0       2       2       3.80       1168/1453       3.83       4.22       4.21       4.11       3.80         5. Did assigneents contribute to what you learned       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       223/1365       4.37       4.32       4.28       4.19       4.00         6. Did wirtten assignments contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       223/1365       4.37       4.11       4.08       3.96       4.60         7. Was the grading system clearly explained       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1426       4.06       4.60       5.00         9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1426       4.71       4.41       4.36       5.00         1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepard       4 </td <td></td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>3</td> <td>4.20</td> <td>962/1504</td> <td>4.17</td> <td>4.24</td> <td>4.27</td> <td>4.13</td> <td>4.20</td>		4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	962/1504	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.20
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       4       0       1       0       0       2       2       3.80       1168/1453       3.83       4.22       4.21       4.11       3.80         5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       247/1421       4.47       4.08       4.00       3.91       4.60         7. Was the grading system clearly explained       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       247/1421       4.47       4.08       4.60       4.60         8. How many times as class cancelled       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.01       4.40       3.97       4.60         9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.36       5.00         9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.43       5.00         1. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared       4       0       0       0       1       4<		4	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals       4       0       1       0       0       2       2       3.80       1168/1453       3.83       4.22       4.21       4.11       3.80         5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       247/1421       4.47       4.08       4.00       3.91       4.60         7. Was the grading system clearly explained       4       0       0       0       1       1       3       4.40       591/1485       4.06       4.60       4.61       4.60       4.60       4.60       4.60       4.60       4.60       4.60       4.61       4.60       4.60 <td>3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals</td> <td>4</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>1</td> <td>0</td> <td>2</td> <td>2</td> <td>4.00</td> <td>937/1290</td> <td>4.07</td> <td>4.32</td> <td>4.28</td> <td>4.19</td> <td>4.00</td>	3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	937/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       223/1365       4.37       4.11       4.08       3.96       4.60         7. Was the grading system clearly explained       4       0       0       0       1       1       3       4.40       591/1485       4.06       4.00       4.00       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1504       4.06       4.66       5.00         9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.36       5.00         1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.36       5.00         3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly       4       0       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       191/1418       4.54       4.29       4.25       4.20       4.80       5.10         2. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/11		4	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1168/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained       4       0       0       0       1       1       3       4.40       591/1485       4.06       4.20       4.16       4.13       4.40         8. How many times was class cancelled       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1504       5.00       4.68       4.69       4.66       5.00         9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1504       5.00       4.68       4.69       4.66       5.00         9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.40       3.97       4.60         2. Did the instructor's seem interested in the subject       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.46       4.20       4.66       5.00         3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       191/1418       4.54       4.20       4.20       4.80       4.20       4.80       4.66	5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1421	4.47	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1504       5.00       4.68       4.69       4.66       5.00         9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness       4       0       0       0       2       3       4.60       258/1483       4.30       4.07       4.06       3.97       4.60         9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1504       5.00       4.68       4.69       4.60       3.97       4.60         Lecture         1. Were the instructor seem interested in the subject       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.46       5.00         3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       191/1418       4.54       4.29       4.25       4.20       4.80         4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/1199       3.60       3.97       3.82       4.80         2. Did the instructor encourage fair and op	6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	223/1365	4.37	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.60
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 258/1483 4.30 4.07 4.06 3.97 4.60 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 4 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1425 4.71 4.41 4.41 4.36 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 4 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1426 4.71 4.72 4.69 4.56 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.80 191/1418 4.54 4.29 4.29 4.20 4.56 5.00 5. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.80 195/1416 4.47 4.34 4.26 4.21 4.80 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 0 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.80 105/1199 3.60 3.95 3.97 3.82 4.80 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 0 1 2 2 4.40 465/1312 4.34 4.12 4.00 3.69 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful 4 0 0 0 0 0 4 1 4.20 328/758 4.18 4.05 4.01 3.80 4.20 Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 233 **** 4.07 4.09 3.90 **** 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.17 4.17 3.83 **** Field Work	7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	591/1485	4.06	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.40
Lecture         1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.41       4.36       5.00         2. Did the instructor's seem interested in the subject       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1426       4.71       4.72       4.69       4.56       5.00         3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       191/1418       4.54       4.29       4.25       4.20       4.80         4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/1199       3.60       3.95       3.97       3.82       4.80         5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/1199       3.60       3.95       3.97       3.82       4.80         1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       1       2       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.24       3.93       4.20	1	4	0	0	0	-	0	5	5.00			4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.36       5.00         2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1426       4.71       4.72       4.69       4.56       5.00         3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       191/1418       4.54       4.29       4.26       4.21       4.80         5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/1199       3.60       3.95       3.97       3.82       4.80         Discussion         1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       1       2       4.40       4.24       4.24       3.93       4.20         2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate       4       0       0       0       1       2       2       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.24       3.93       4.20         3.	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1483	4.30	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.60
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1425       4.71       4.41       4.36       5.00         2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject       4       0       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1426       4.71       4.72       4.69       4.56       5.00         3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       191/1418       4.54       4.29       4.26       4.21       4.80         5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/1199       3.60       3.95       3.97       3.82       4.80         Discussion         1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       1       2       4.40       4.24       4.24       3.93       4.20         2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate       4       0       0       0       1       2       2       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.24       3.93       4.20         3.															
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject       4       0       0       0       5       5.00       1/1426       4.71       4.72       4.69       4.56       5.00         3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       191/1418       4.54       4.29       4.25       4.20       4.80         4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       191/1418       4.54       4.29       4.25       4.20       4.80         5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/1199       3.60       3.95       3.97       3.82       4.80         Discussion         1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       3       2       4.40       4.34       4.12       4.00       3.69       4.40         2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.20         4. Were special techniques succe		4	0	0	0	0	0	-	F 0.0	1/1/05	4 17 1	4 4 1	4 4 1	1 20	F 00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       191/1418       4.54       4.29       4.25       4.20       4.80         4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       255/1416       4.47       4.34       4.26       4.21       4.80         5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/1199       3.60       3.95       3.97       3.82       4.80         Discussion         1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       3       2       4.40       465/1312       4.34       4.12       4.00       3.69       4.40         2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.20         4. Were special techniques successful       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       328/758       4.18       4.07       4.09       3.90       ****         1. Di		4	-	•	-	-	0	5		-					
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       255/1416       4.47       4.34       4.26       4.21       4.80         5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/1199       3.60       3.95       3.97       3.82       4.80         Discussion         1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       3       2       4.40       465/1312       4.34       4.12       4.00       3.69       4.40         2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate       4       0       0       0       1       2       2       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.24       3.93       4.20         3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       834/1299       4.46       4.34       4.25       3.94       4.20         4       0       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       328/758       4.18       4.05       4.01       3.80       4.20				-						,					
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding       4       0       0       0       1       4       4.80       105/1199       3.60       3.95       3.97       3.82       4.80         Discussion       1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       3       2       4.40       465/1312       4.34       4.12       4.00       3.69       4.40         2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate       4       0       0       0       1       2       2       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.20         3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       834/1299       4.46       4.34       4.25       3.94       4.20         4. Were special techniques successful       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       328/758       4.18       4.05       4.01       3.80       4.20         1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.07       4.09       3.90       ****         5. Were criteria for grading made clear				-	-	-	_	-		- / -					
Discussion         1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       3       2       4.40       465/1312       4.34       4.12       4.00       3.69       4.40         2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate       4       0       0       0       1       2       2       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.24       3.93       4.20         3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       834/1299       4.46       4.34       4.25       3.94       4.20         4. Were special techniques successful       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       328/758       4.18       4.05       4.01       3.80       4.20         Laboratory       1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.07       4.09       3.90       ****         5. Were criteria for grading made clear       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.17       4.17       3.83       ****	-			-	-		⊥ 1	-							
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned       4       0       0       0       3       2       4.40       465/1312       4.34       4.12       4.00       3.69       4.40         2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate       4       0       0       0       1       2       2       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.24       3.93       4.20         3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       834/1299       4.46       4.34       4.25       3.94       4.20         4       0       0       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       328/758       4.18       4.05       4.01       3.80       4.20         4       0       0       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.07       4.09       3.90       ****         Laboratory       1       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.07       4.09       3.90       ****         5. Were criteria for grading made clear       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       **** </td <td>5. Did additivistal techniques enhance your understanding</td> <td>т</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>0</td> <td>Ŧ</td> <td>т</td> <td>1.00</td> <td>103/1199</td> <td>5.00</td> <td>3.95</td> <td>5.91</td> <td>5.02</td> <td>4.00</td>	5. Did additivistal techniques enhance your understanding	т	0	0	0	0	Ŧ	т	1.00	103/1199	5.00	3.95	5.91	5.02	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate       4       0       0       0       1       2       2       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.24       3.93       4.20         3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       833/1303       3.96       4.39       4.24       3.93       4.20         4. Were special techniques successful       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       834/1299       4.46       4.34       4.25       3.94       4.20         Laboratory       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       328/758       4.18       4.05       4.01       3.80       4.20         Laboratory       1.       Did the lab increase understanding of the material       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.07       4.09       3.90       ****         Seminar       5.       Were criteria for grading made clear       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.17       4.17       3.83       ****	Discussion														
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       834/1299       4.46       4.34       4.25       3.94       4.20         4. Were special techniques successful       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       328/758       4.18       4.05       4.01       3.80       4.20         Laboratory       1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.07       4.09       3.90       ****         Seminar       5. Were criteria for grading made clear       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.17       4.17       3.83       ****	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	465/1312	4.34	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful       4       0       0       0       4       1       4.20       328/758       4.18       4.05       4.01       3.80       4.20         Laboratory       1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.07       4.09       3.90       ****         5. Were criteria for grading made clear       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00       ****       4.17       4.17       3.83       ****         Field Work	2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	833/1303	3.96	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.20
Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 8 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/233 **** 4.07 4.09 3.90 **** Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/73 **** 4.17 4.17 3.83 **** Field Work	3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	834/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.20
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00 ****/233 **** 4.07 4.09 3.90 ****         Seminar         5. Were criteria for grading made clear       8       0       0       1       0       0       3.00 ****/73 **** 4.17 4.17 3.83 ****         Field Work	4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	328/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.20
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material       8       0       0       1       0       3.00 ****/233 **** 4.07 4.09 3.90 ****         Seminar         5. Were criteria for grading made clear       8       0       0       1       0       3.00 ****/73 **** 4.17 4.17 3.83 ****         Field Work															
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.17 4.17 3.83 **** Field Work	1	~	0	~	•	-	~	~				4 0 7			
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.17 4.17 3.83 **** Field Work	1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	* * * *	4.07	4.09	3.90	* * * *
5. Were criteria for grading made clear 8 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 73 **** 4.17 4.17 3.83 **** Field Work	Seminar														
Field Work		8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	* * * *	4.17	4.17	3.83	* * * *
	5. Were official for grading made official	Ũ	Ū	0	0	-	Ũ	Ũ	5.00	, , , , ,		1.1/	1.1/	5.05	
	Field Work														
I. DIA FIELA EXPERIENCE CONTRIDUTE TO WHAT YOU LEARNED 8 0 0 0 I 0 0 3.00 ****/ 58 **** 3.98 4.43 3.63 ****	1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	* * * *	3.98	4.43	3.63	* * * *
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 8 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 56 **** 4.12 4.23 4.11 ****				0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	* * * *	4.12	4.23	4.11	* * * *
3. Was the instructor available for consultation 8 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 44 **** 4.68 4.65 4.60 ****	3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	* * * *	4.68	4.65	4.60	* * * *

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Cum. GPA E			Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	4	А	0	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 071 8010 Title ADV ACADEMIC DISCOURSE Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A Enrollment: 4 Questionnaires: 3 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005 Page 601 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

Student	('OIITGO	$h''_{12} = 1$	()ILCCTION	$n \ge 1 r \square$
Duduuliu	COULBC	Evaluation	OUCBLIOIN	JULLC

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		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	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1403/1504	3.33	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 0 0	716/1210	1 00	1 10	4.00	2 60	1 00
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	T	0	1 2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12		3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate		0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	0	∠ 2	5.00	1/1303	5.00 5.00	4.39 4.34	4.24 4.25	3.93 3.94	5.00 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	0	1	1	5.00 4.50	1/1299 185/ 758	5.00 4.50	4.34	4.25 4.01	3.94	5.00 4.50
4. Were special techniques successful			U	U	U	Т	T	4.50	T02/ /28	4.50	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.50

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

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 3

## University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2005

Page 602 JUN 14, 2005 Job IRBR3029

# 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	2	0	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	3.82	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.00
		Ŭ	Ŭ	Ũ	Ŭ	-	Ŭ	1.00	20., .00	1.00	1.00		5.00	1.00

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	L .	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	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	С	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	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						