

Course Section: LING 210 0101
 Title INTRO TO LANG STRUCTUR
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1074
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	21	4.83	183/1669	4.83	4.33	4.23	4.34	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	16	4.58	461/1666	4.58	4.28	4.19	4.29	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	17	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.35	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	323/1617	4.67	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	8	14	4.50	340/1555	4.50	4.17	4.00	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	8	11	4.36	552/1543	4.36	4.19	4.06	4.10	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	4	17	4.54	435/1647	4.54	4.18	4.12	4.19	4.54	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	249/1605	4.65	4.13	4.07	4.15	4.65	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	170/1514	4.91	4.39	4.39	4.39	4.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.72	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	300/1503	4.74	4.31	4.24	4.29	4.74	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	21	4.83	261/1506	4.83	4.40	4.26	4.33	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	6	5	7	3.89	705/1311	3.89	3.78	3.85	3.96	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	622/1490	4.33	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.31	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	434/1489	4.75	4.43	4.29	4.36	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	8	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	3.99	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 11	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 14
28-55	6	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 8	Under-grad 24 Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 12	
			? 0		

Course Section: LING 310 0101
 Title PHONOLOGY & MORPHOLOGY
 Instructor: KA, OMAR
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1075
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	218/1666	4.78	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	392/1421	4.67	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	146/1617	4.83	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	159/1555	4.78	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.78	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.71	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	123/1647	4.89	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	170/1605	4.75	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.39	4.39	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.72	4.66	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.31	4.24	4.28	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.40	4.26	4.30	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1311	****	3.78	3.85	3.97	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.26	4.05	4.11	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.35	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1006	****	4.14	4.00	4.10	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	9
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 7
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	8
			? 1		

Course Section: LING 350 101
 Title HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 42
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1076
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	5	19	4.65	404/1669	4.65	4.33	4.23	4.28	4.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	20	4.80	181/1666	4.80	4.28	4.19	4.20	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	121/1421	4.92	4.36	4.24	4.25	4.92	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	11	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	265/1617	4.71	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	17	4.64	237/1555	4.64	4.17	4.00	4.03	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	18	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	180/1543	4.75	4.19	4.06	4.14	4.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	167/1647	4.81	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.81	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	750/1668	4.88	4.60	4.67	4.68	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	298/1605	4.60	4.13	4.07	4.09	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	376/1514	4.79	4.39	4.39	4.46	4.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	256/1551	4.96	4.72	4.66	4.70	4.96	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	5	19	4.79	231/1503	4.79	4.31	4.24	4.28	4.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	299/1506	4.79	4.40	4.26	4.30	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	2	2	6	11	4.24	458/1311	4.24	3.78	3.85	3.97	4.24	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	445/1490	4.50	4.26	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	504/1502	4.64	4.54	4.26	4.28	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	329/1489	4.86	4.43	4.29	4.35	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	5	2	0	1	3	3	3.56	744/1006	3.56	4.14	4.00	4.10	3.56	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 1	A 20	Required for Majors	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 1	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	6
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 26
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course Section: LING 470 0101
 Title LANGUAGE & COGNITION
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1077
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1669	5.00	4.33	4.23	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	549/1666	4.50	4.28	4.19	4.22	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1357/1421	3.00	4.36	4.24	4.38	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	717/1617	4.33	4.27	4.15	4.22	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1555	5.00	4.17	4.00	4.08	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	895/1543	4.00	4.19	4.06	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1043/1647	4.00	4.18	4.12	4.14	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	965/1668	4.75	4.60	4.67	4.70	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	373/1605	4.50	4.13	4.07	4.16	4.50	

Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	441/1514	4.75	4.39	4.39	4.45	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	880/1551	4.75	4.72	4.66	4.73	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.31	4.24	4.27	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	353/1506	4.75	4.40	4.26	4.29	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	587/1311	4.00	3.78	3.85	3.88	4.00	

Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1490	5.00	4.26	4.05	4.26	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1502	5.00	4.54	4.26	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.43	4.29	4.52	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 4
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	3
			? 1		

Course Section: LING 694 0101
 Title THE GRAMMAR OF AMERICA
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 1078
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	183/1669	4.83	4.33	4.23	4.35	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	218/1666	4.78	4.28	4.19	4.19	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	318/1421	4.72	4.36	4.24	4.33	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	253/1617	4.72	4.27	4.15	4.24	4.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	418/1555	4.43	4.17	4.00	4.07	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.19	4.06	4.27	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	150/1647	4.83	4.18	4.12	4.15	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.60	4.67	4.83	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	135/1605	4.81	4.13	4.07	4.13	4.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	113/1514	4.94	4.39	4.39	4.37	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	307/1551	4.94	4.72	4.66	4.72	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	191/1503	4.83	4.31	4.24	4.22	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	249/1506	4.83	4.40	4.26	4.24	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	11	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	731/1311	3.86	3.78	3.85	3.89	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	380/1490	4.61	4.26	4.05	4.18	4.61	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	486/1502	4.67	4.54	4.26	4.46	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	4	1	13	4.50	684/1489	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.44	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	711/1006	3.64	4.14	4.00	4.11	3.64	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	****	4.19	4.41	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	4.33	4.22	4.53	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 52	****	4.00	4.06	4.57	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	5.00	4.39	4.90	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.00	3.97	4.31	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	5.00	4.33	4.55	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	4.42	4.34	4.45	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.31	4.40	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	4.33	4.45	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	****	****	4.25	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	15
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0
Grad.	12	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0

			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	5	Under-grad
			Electives	1	Non-major
			Other	13	
			#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant		