

Course-Section: LING 210 1
 Title Intro To Lang Structur
 Instructor: Young,Steven R
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 933
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	13	4.35	789/1509	4.35	4.42	4.31	4.34	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	12	4.39	709/1509	4.39	4.39	4.26	4.32	4.39
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	602/1287	4.43	4.48	4.30	4.35	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	432/1459	4.53	4.32	4.22	4.30	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	14	4.52	319/1406	4.52	4.19	4.09	4.09	4.52
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	8	12	4.45	394/1384	4.45	4.17	4.11	4.09	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	5	15	4.59	352/1489	4.59	4.07	4.17	4.19	4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.61	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	3	12	4	4.05	826/1463	4.05	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.05
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	1	19	4.73	497/1438	4.73	4.48	4.46	4.48	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	537/1421	4.90	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	7	12	4.43	713/1411	4.43	4.39	4.31	4.37	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	6	13	4.41	758/1405	4.41	4.45	4.32	4.39	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	2	4	4	8	3.84	804/1236	3.84	3.92	4.00	4.11	3.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.32	4.14	4.19	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	1	3	2	8	4.21	810/1255	4.21	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.21
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	3	3	8	4.36	756/1258	4.36	4.46	4.38	4.44	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	10	8	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	****/ 873	****	4.14	4.03	4.04	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.16	4.54	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 198	****	****	4.22	4.51	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	****	4.48	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 177	****	****	4.36	4.65	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 165	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 89	****	5.00	4.49	5.00	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.54	****	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 90	****	4.62	4.50	****	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.93	4.38	4.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	4.86	4.06	2.88	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	****	4.39	4.79	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	****	4.41	4.50	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.51	4.83	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	****	4.18	4.56	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	****	4.32	4.67	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 49	****	****	4.26	4.33	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.14	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 46	****	****	4.31	4.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.05	****	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.27	****	****

Course-Section: LING 210 1
 Title Intro To Lang Structur
 Instructor: Young, Steven R
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 933
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	8	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	6	Under-grad	23	Non-major	17
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	8	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: LING 310 1
 Title Phonology & Morphology
 Instructor: Young, Steven R
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 934
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					5	Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	Mean		Rank						
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1509	5.00	4.42	4.31	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	774/1509	4.33	4.39	4.26	4.25	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1287	5.00	4.48	4.30	4.33	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	146/1459	4.80	4.32	4.22	4.26	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	223/1406	4.67	4.19	4.09	4.12	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	349/1384	4.50	4.17	4.11	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	854/1489	4.17	4.07	4.17	4.14	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.55	4.67	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	325/1463	4.50	4.16	4.09	4.08	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	675/1438	4.60	4.48	4.46	4.43	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	243/1411	4.80	4.39	4.31	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.45	4.32	4.32	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	415/1260	4.50	4.32	4.14	4.22	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.53	4.33	4.37	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	620/1258	4.50	4.46	4.38	4.42	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1	General 0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1			
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0			
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: LING 410 1
 Title Language Planning
 Instructor: Crandall,Joann
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 935
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1509	4.88	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509	4.75	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	151/1287	4.88	4.48	4.30	4.38	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	191/1459	4.75	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	103/1406	4.88	4.19	4.09	4.11	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	107/1384	4.80	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	192/1489	4.75	4.07	4.17	4.18	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	973/1506	4.63	4.55	4.67	4.67	4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	99/1463	4.86	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.48	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.75	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.39	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.45	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	274/1236	4.50	3.92	4.00	4.03	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.32	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	5.00	4.53	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.46	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	4.67	4.14	4.03	4.26	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 89	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	30/ 92	4.86	4.93	4.54	4.83	4.86
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	51/ 90	4.57	4.62	4.50	4.69	4.57
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	16/ 92	4.86	4.93	4.38	4.64	4.86
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	20/ 93	4.71	4.86	4.06	4.32	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	7
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 1 Major 7
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1 Under-grad 7 Non-major 1
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LING 470 1
 Title Language & Cognition
 Instructor: Westphal, German
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2009

Page 936
 MAR 22, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	724/1509	4.40	4.42	4.31	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	922/1509	4.20	4.39	4.26	4.26	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1287	****	4.48	4.30	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	979/1459	4.00	4.32	4.22	4.32	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1140/1406	3.60	4.19	4.09	4.11	3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	807/1384	4.00	4.17	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1359/1489	3.33	4.07	4.17	4.18	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	2.40	1503/1506	2.40	4.55	4.67	4.67	2.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.16	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1203/1438	4.00	4.48	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	1292/1421	4.25	4.75	4.73	4.76	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	617/1411	4.50	4.39	4.31	4.35	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.45	4.32	4.34	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	4.32	4.14	4.25	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1255	4.50	4.53	4.33	4.46	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	932/1258	4.00	4.46	4.38	4.51	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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