```
Course-Section: LING 210  0101         University of Maryland                          Page 1037
Title       INTRO TO LANG STRUCTUR        Baltimore County                             FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  YOUNG, STEVEN                Fall   2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    29
Questionnaires: 13                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                        Frequencies        Instructor   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  8  4  4.33  871/1649  4.33  4.34  4.28  4.29  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  1  2  5  4  4.00 1124/1648  4.00  4.31  4.23  4.25  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  5  6  4.42  653/1375  4.42  4.42  4.27  4.37  4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   2  0  1  1  4  4  4.10 1010/1595  4.10  4.29  4.20  4.22  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  1  5  5  4.17  703/1533  4.17  4.16  4.04  4.04  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  2  0  0  4  6  4.00  883/1512  4.00  4.19  4.10  4.14  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  0  0  2  3  7  4.42  621/1623  4.42  4.08  4.16  4.21  4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92  597/1646  4.92  4.59  4.69  4.63  4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  2  7  1  3.90 1060/1621  3.90  4.14  4.06  4.01  3.90

          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  5  7  4.58  755/1568  4.58  4.39  4.43  4.39  4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.79  4.70  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  5  6  4.42  767/1564  4.42  4.28  4.28  4.27  4.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  2  6  4  4.17 1031/1559  4.17  4.43  4.29  4.33  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 3  0  1  3  4  1  3.56 1025/1352  3.56  3.97  3.98  4.07  3.56

          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7  0  0  0  4  0  2  3.67 1011/1384  3.67  4.28  4.08  3.99  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7  0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 1146/1382  3.67  4.57  4.29  4.19  3.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67 1129/1368  3.67  4.42  4.30  4.21  3.67
```

                              Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades       Reasons                Type                   Majors
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0        0.00-0.99   0        A    5        Required for Majors  1    Graduate     0     Major       8
 28-55     1        1.00-1.99   0        B    5                                                     
 56-83     3        2.00-2.99   0        C    1        General              1    Under-grad  13     Non-major   5
 84-150    2        3.00-3.49   4        D    0                                                     
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00   2        F    0        Electives            1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                  responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                9
                                         ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: LING 350  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1038
Title      HISTORICAL LINGUISTICS            Baltimore County                               FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  MCCRAY, STANLEY                 Fall  2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 18                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                         Frequencies       Instructor   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  2  2  7  7  4.06 1149/1649  4.06  4.34 4.28 4.27  4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  3 13  4.61  427/1648  4.61  4.31 4.23 4.18  4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  3 15  4.83  212/1375  4.83  4.42 4.27 4.22  4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0 10  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  362/1595  4.63  4.29 4.20 4.21  4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1  1  1  1  2 11  4.31  565/1533  4.31  4.16 4.04 4.05  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 14  0  0  0  2  2  4.50 ****/1512  ****  4.19 4.10 4.11  ****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  1  0  0 17  4.83  154/1623  4.83  4.08 4.16 4.08  4.83
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0 10  8  4.44 1249/1646  4.44  4.59 4.69 4.67  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  0  3  5 10  4.39  535/1621  4.39  4.14 4.06 4.02  4.39


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  1  4 13  4.67  636/1568  4.67  4.39 4.43 4.39  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0 18  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.79 4.70 4.64  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  390/1564  4.72  4.28 4.28 4.25  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  434/1559  4.72  4.43 4.29 4.23  4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  1  1  1  0  4  9  4.27  508/1352  4.27  3.97 3.98 3.97  4.27


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  1  4  5  4.40  541/1384  4.40  4.28 4.08 4.11  4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  2  1  7  4.50  616/1382  4.50  4.57 4.29 4.37  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90  264/1368  4.90  4.42 4.30 4.39  4.90
4. Were special techniques successful                  8  2  0  0  2  2  4  4.25  342/ 948  4.25  4.10 3.95 4.00  4.25


           Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 13  0  0  5  0  0  0  2.00  522/ 555  2.00  2.56 4.29 4.22  2.00


           Seminar
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                12  3  3  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 288  ****  2.95 3.68 3.58  ****


           Field Work
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16  0  1  0  1  0  0  2.00 ****/ 312  ****  2.48 3.68 3.60  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type              Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0     A  18        Required for Majors  1     Graduate    1     Major       12
28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0     B   0
56-83     3       2.00-2.99    1     C   0        General              5     Under-grad 17     Non-major    6
84-150   11       3.00-3.49    8     D   0
Grad.     1       3.50-4.00    8     F   0        Electives            0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                     P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                     I   0        Other               12
                                     ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: LING 360  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1039
Title      SOCIOLING & DIALECTOLO          Baltimore County                                  FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:    FIELD, THOMAS T              Fall  2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:      21
Questionnaires:  10                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

|                                                      |    |    | Freq | uenc | ies |   |    | Instr | uctor   | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|---------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions                                            | NR | NA | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | Mean  | Rank    | Mean   | Mean | Mean | Mean  | Mean |

General

|                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | Mean | Rank      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8  | 4.80 | 274/1649  | 4.80   | 4.34 | 4.28 | 4.27  | 4.80 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7  | 4.70 | 323/1648  | 4.70   | 4.31 | 4.23 | 4.18  | 4.70 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1375    | 5.00   | 4.42 | 4.27 | 4.22  | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals          | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 4.90 | 133/1595  | 4.90   | 4.29 | 4.20 | 4.21  | 4.90 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned      | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8  | 4.80 | 151/1533  | 4.80   | 4.16 | 4.04 | 4.05  | 4.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 4.90 | 110/1512  | 4.90   | 4.19 | 4.10 | 4.11  | 4.90 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained                  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7  | 4.70 | 284/1623  | 4.70   | 4.08 | 4.16 | 4.08  | 4.70 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled                        | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5  | 4.50 | 1193/1646 | 4.50   | 4.59 | 4.69 | 4.67  | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness    | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 4.90 | 94/1621   | 4.90   | 4.14 | 4.06 | 4.02  | 4.90 |

Lecture

|                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | Mean | Rank      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared              | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 4.90 | 245/1568  | 4.90   | 4.39 | 4.43 | 4.39  | 4.90 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject         | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 5.00 | 1/1572    | 5.00   | 4.79 | 4.70 | 4.64  | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly      | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 4.90 | 169/1564  | 4.90   | 4.28 | 4.28 | 4.25  | 4.90 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9  | 4.90 | 205/1559  | 4.90   | 4.43 | 4.29 | 4.23  | 4.90 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding     | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6  | 4.50 | 303/1352  | 4.50   | 3.97 | 3.98 | 3.97  | 4.50 |

Discussion

|                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Mean | Rank     | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned      | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3.80 | 937/1384 | 3.80   | 4.28 | 4.08 | 4.11  | 3.80 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate      | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 342/1382 | 4.80   | 4.57 | 4.29 | 4.37  | 4.80 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion     | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1368   | 5.00   | 4.42 | 4.30 | 4.39  | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful                        | 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.00 | 431/ 948 | 4.00   | 4.10 | 3.95 | 4.00  | 4.00 |

Laboratory

|                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Mean | Rank      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified       | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 555 | ****   | 2.56 | 4.29 | 4.22  | **** |

Seminar

|                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Mean | Rank      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear                      | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 288 | ****   | 2.95 | 3.68 | 3.58  | **** |

Field Work

|                                                              |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Mean | Rank      | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities       | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 312 | ****   | 2.48 | 3.68 | 3.60  | **** |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned |   | Cum. GPA  |   | Expected Grades |   | Reasons             |   | Type       |    | Majors    |   |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|------------|----|-----------|---|
| 00-27          | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A               | 7 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate   | 0  | Major     | 9 |
| 28-55          | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | B               | 1 |                     |   |            |    |           |   |
| 56-83          | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C               | 2 | General             | 1 | Under-grad | 10 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150         | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D               | 0 |                     |   |            |    |           |   |
| Grad.          | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F               | 0 | Electives           | 1 | #### - Means there are not enough | | | |
|                |   |           |   | P               | 0 |                     |   | responses to be significant | | | |
|                |   |           |   | I               | 0 | Other               | 8 |            |    |           |   |
|                |   |           |   | ?               | 0 |                     |   |            |    |           |   |

```
Course-Section: LING 450  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1040
Title       APPLIED LINGUISTICS                 Baltimore County                                FEB 11, 2009
Instructor:  YOUNG, STEVEN                      Fall  2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     11
Questionnaires:  8                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies        Instructor   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  0  2  6  4.75  328/1649  4.75  4.34  4.28  4.50  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1  6  4.63  414/1648  4.63  4.31  4.23  4.36  4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   6  0  0  0  1  1  4.50  546/1375  4.50  4.42  4.27  4.48  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   1  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  162/1595  4.86  4.29  4.20  4.36  4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned  0  5  0  1  0  1  1  3.67 1139/1533  3.67  4.16  4.04  4.14  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned  0  1  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  133/1512  4.86  4.19  4.10  4.26  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained          0   0  1  1  5  0  1  2.88 1563/1623  2.88  4.08  4.16  4.27  2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                0   0  0  0  0  5  3  4.38 1310/1646  4.38  4.59  4.69  4.71  4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness  1  0  0  0  1  4  2  4.14  812/1621  4.14  4.14  4.06  4.24  4.14


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared      2   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  636/1568  4.67  4.39  4.43  4.54  4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1572  5.00  4.79  4.70  4.79  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly  2  0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  854/1564  4.33  4.28  4.28  4.40  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned   2   1  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  318/1559  4.80  4.43  4.29  4.41  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding  2  5  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/1352  ****  3.97  3.98  4.07  ****


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned  6  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1384  5.00  4.28  4.08  4.35  5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate  6  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1382  5.00  4.57  4.29  4.56  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion  6  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00    1/1368  5.00  4.42  4.30  4.58  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                6   1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 948  ****  4.10  3.95  4.31  ****

              Laboratory
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified  6  0  0  0  2  0  0  3.00  490/ 555  3.00  2.56  4.29  4.41  3.00


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme  7  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  88  ****  4.39  4.54  4.66  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention  7  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  85  ****  4.20  4.47  4.54  ****

                               Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A    5        Required for Majors  0    Graduate      0    Major       7
 28-55      0      1.00-1.99    0      B    2
 56-83      1      2.00-2.99    0      C    1        General              1    Under-grad    8    Non-major   1
 84-150     4      3.00-3.49    1      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    4      F    0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0        Other                7
                                       ?    0
```