

Course-Section: LING 190 0101  
 Title: WORLD OF LANGUAGE  
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 938  
 JUN 26, 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	4	14	13	4.29	859/1522	4.29	4.36	4.30	4.14	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	10	18	4.48	576/1522	4.48	4.33	4.26	4.18	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	8	17	4.32	714/1285	4.32	4.45	4.30	4.22	4.32	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	7	9	11	4.07	971/1476	4.07	4.33	4.22	4.09	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	3	12	13	4.28	547/1412	4.28	4.26	4.06	4.01	4.28	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	7	11	10	3.84	992/1381	3.84	4.19	4.08	3.93	3.84	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	8	21	4.61	374/1500	4.61	4.14	4.18	4.16	4.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	29	4.97	195/1517	4.97	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.97	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	2	7	10	8	3.89	1049/1497	3.89	4.21	4.11	4.02	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	8	19	4.50	798/1440	4.50	4.45	4.45	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	7	20	4.59	1089/1448	4.59	4.79	4.71	4.63	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	4	9	15	4.23	896/1436	4.23	4.39	4.29	4.24	4.23	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	2	9	16	4.20	928/1432	4.20	4.47	4.29	4.23	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	9	15	4.37	380/1221	4.37	3.91	3.93	3.86	4.37	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	20	0	1	3	2	2	3	3.27	1126/1280	3.27	4.28	4.10	3.92	3.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	20	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1075/1277	3.73	4.60	4.34	4.13	3.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	20	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	855/1269	4.09	4.47	4.31	4.04	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	20	8	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 854	****	4.16	4.02	3.87	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 8		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	2
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 31
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	19
			? 0		

Course-Section: LING 290 0101  
 Title INTRO TO APPLIED LING  
 Instructor: KA, OMAR  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 939  
 JUN 26, 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	1	1	5	4	4.09	1060/1522	4.09	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.09	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	750/1522	4.36	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	531/1285	4.50	4.45	4.30	4.36	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	285/1476	4.70	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	257/1412	4.64	4.26	4.06	4.00	4.64	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	482/1381	4.36	4.19	4.08	3.97	4.36	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1147/1500	3.80	4.14	4.18	4.20	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.56	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	544/1497	4.36	4.21	4.11	4.11	4.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	643/1440	4.64	4.45	4.45	4.42	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	207/1436	4.82	4.39	4.29	4.29	4.82	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	590/1432	4.55	4.47	4.29	4.31	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	363/1280	4.55	4.28	4.10	4.08	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	308/1277	4.82	4.60	4.34	4.33	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	287/ 854	4.33	4.16	4.02	4.00	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LING 360 0101  
 Title SOCIOLING & DIALECTOLO  
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 940  
 JUN 26, 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	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	433/1522	4.67	4.36	4.30	4.34	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	201/1522	4.80	4.33	4.26	4.25	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	105/1285	4.93	4.45	4.30	4.30	4.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	178/1476	4.80	4.33	4.22	4.26	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	12	4.53	322/1412	4.53	4.26	4.06	4.03	4.53	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	413/1381	4.43	4.19	4.08	4.13	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	160/1500	4.80	4.14	4.18	4.13	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	5	4.27	1262/1517	4.27	4.56	4.65	4.62	4.27	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	304/1497	4.62	4.21	4.11	4.13	4.62	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	134/1440	4.93	4.45	4.45	4.46	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	160/1436	4.87	4.39	4.29	4.30	4.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	294/1432	4.80	4.47	4.29	4.29	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	0	1	2	9	4.38	373/1221	4.38	3.91	3.93	3.94	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	572/1280	4.27	4.28	4.10	4.14	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	498/1277	4.64	4.60	4.34	4.38	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.39	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	8	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 854	****	4.16	4.02	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 10	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	15
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0		Major 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	11
			? 1		

Course-Section: LING 450 0101  
 Title APPLIED LINGUISTICS  
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 941  
 JUN 26, 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	0	8	4.78	290/1522	4.78	4.36	4.30	4.42	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	142/1522	4.89	4.33	4.26	4.34	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.45	4.30	4.42	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.33	4.22	4.31	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	231/1412	4.67	4.26	4.06	4.11	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	233/1381	4.63	4.19	4.08	4.21	4.63	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1500	4.63	4.14	4.18	4.25	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	1349/1517	4.11	4.56	4.65	4.71	4.11	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	134/1497	4.83	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.45	4.45	4.52	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.79	4.71	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.39	4.29	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	92/1221	4.83	3.91	3.93	4.04	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.28	4.10	4.28	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.60	4.34	4.50	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.47	4.31	4.49	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.16	4.02	4.31	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	9
			P 0		Non-major
			I 0		1
			? 2	Other	8

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LING 694 0101  
 Title THE GRAMMAR OF AMERICA  
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2007

Page 942  
 JUN 26, 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	1	15	4.94	123/1522	4.94	4.36	4.30	4.45	4.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	89/1522	4.94	4.33	4.26	4.29	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	318/1285	4.71	4.45	4.30	4.31	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	172/1476	4.81	4.33	4.22	4.31	4.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	9	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	299/1412	4.57	4.26	4.06	4.25	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	207/1381	4.67	4.19	4.08	4.25	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	483/1500	4.50	4.14	4.18	4.22	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	341/1517	4.94	4.56	4.65	4.73	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	181/1497	4.77	4.21	4.11	4.21	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	134/1440	4.94	4.45	4.45	4.48	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	346/1448	4.94	4.79	4.71	4.80	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	86/1436	4.94	4.39	4.29	4.37	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.47	4.29	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.91	3.93	3.83	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	350/1280	4.56	4.28	4.10	4.24	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	308/1277	4.81	4.60	4.34	4.52	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	493/1269	4.63	4.47	4.31	4.51	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	8	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	426/ 854	4.00	4.16	4.02	4.08	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 228	****	4.50	4.35	4.39	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	5.00	4.52	4.70	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	5.00	4.49	4.71	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.83	4.45	4.66	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.83	4.11	4.38	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	3.00	4.40	4.78	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	3.00	4.31	4.71	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	2.75	4.30	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	4.33	4.63	4.82	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 23	****	****	4.41	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 22	****	****	4.54	4.83	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 18	****	****	4.49	4.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	11
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0
Grad.	8	3.50-4.00	5	F	0
				P	0
				Required for Majors	1
				General	2
				Electives	0
				Graduate	8
				Under-grad	8
				Major	0
				Non-major	16
#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant					

I	0	Other	13
?	0		