

Course-Section: LING 190 0101  
 Title: WORLD OF LANGUAGE  
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA  
 Enrollment: 45  
 Questionnaires: 35

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1003  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	4	2	12	7	10	3.49	1452/1576	3.49	4.34	4.30	4.11	3.49	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	5	9	9	7	3.23	1490/1576	3.23	4.32	4.27	4.18	3.23	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	2	7	13	10	3.71	1150/1342	3.71	4.48	4.32	4.19	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	7	2	6	8	4	3.00	1466/1520	3.00	4.30	4.25	4.09	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	11	7	15	3.94	933/1465	3.94	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	3	8	3	9	7	4	2.87	1395/1434	2.87	4.22	4.14	3.94	2.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	0	5	5	21	4.30	784/1547	4.30	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	4	13	17	4.38	1219/1574	4.38	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.38	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	2	3	13	7	2	3.15	1420/1554	3.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.15	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	3	6	11	11	3.79	1347/1488	3.79	4.39	4.47	4.41	3.79	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	3	0	6	12	12	3.91	1441/1493	3.91	4.78	4.73	4.65	3.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	4	4	10	9	7	3.32	1377/1486	3.32	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.32	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	4	8	13	6	3.44	1332/1489	3.44	4.40	4.32	4.22	3.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	3	1	9	8	9	3.63	958/1277	3.63	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.63	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	23	0	3	1	3	3	2	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	23	0	1	6	1	3	1	2.75	1238/1270	2.75	4.57	4.35	4.09	2.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	23	0	3	2	3	2	2	2.83	1234/1269	2.83	4.38	4.35	4.09	2.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	23	9	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 878	****	4.19	4.05	3.91	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 19		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 4	C 9	General 2	Under-grad 35 Non-major 32
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 13	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 18	
			? 0		

Course-Section: LING 290 0101  
 Title INTRO TO APPLIED LING  
 Instructor: KA, OMAR  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1004  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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		
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	893/1576	4.31	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.31
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	462/1576	4.62	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	552/1342	4.54	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.54
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	173/1520	4.85	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	498/1465	4.42	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	673/1547	4.42	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.42
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	4	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	505/1488	4.75	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	468/1486	4.67	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	1	8	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	463/1277	4.33	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.89	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	5	4	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 4	Under-grad 13 Non-major 11
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 3	
			? 1		

Course-Section: LING 320 0101  
 Title SYNTAX  
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1005  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	2	3	4	2	3.55	1431/1576	3.55	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	4	1	3.18	1499/1576	3.18	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.18
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	1	0	2	0	1	3.00	1466/1520	3.00	4.30	4.25	4.25	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	989/1465	3.91	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	2	2	1	3.14	1346/1434	3.14	4.22	4.14	4.15	3.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	1418/1547	3.22	4.12	4.19	4.21	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	6	4	1	3.55	1554/1574	3.55	4.55	4.64	4.61	3.55
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	3	3	4	0	2.91	1485/1554	2.91	4.13	4.10	4.09	2.91
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	2	1	2	2.89	1463/1488	2.89	4.39	4.47	4.47	2.89
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1167/1493	4.56	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	3	1	3	0	2.56	1468/1486	2.56	4.33	4.32	4.32	2.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	4	2	3	0	2.89	1442/1489	2.89	4.40	4.32	4.34	2.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	4.30	4.17	4.20	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	784/1270	4.33	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1067/1269	3.67	4.38	4.35	4.41	3.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	0 Graduate
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		0 Major
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0		11 Non-major
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	11

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

Course-Section: LING 330 0101  
 Title LANGUAGE IN CONTEXT  
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1006  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.30	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.30	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.25	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1547	5.00	4.12	4.19	4.21	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1459/1574	4.00	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.13	4.10	4.09	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1488	5.00	4.39	4.47	4.47	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1486	5.00	4.33	4.32	4.32	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.99	4.03	4.11	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: LING 490 0101  
 Title SEM IN APPLIED LING  
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2009

Page 1007  
 JUL 2, 2009  
 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	4	4.43	757/1576	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	187/1576	4.86	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	209/1342	4.86	4.48	4.32	4.46	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.30	4.25	4.38	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	483/1465	4.43	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	4.14	797/1434	4.14	4.22	4.14	4.30	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	445/1547	4.57	4.12	4.19	4.24	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1398/1574	4.14	4.55	4.64	4.69	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	316/1554	4.60	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	1048/1488	4.33	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	241/1486	4.83	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	2	0	0	3	1	3.17	1128/1277	3.17	3.99	4.03	4.04	3.17	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.31	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	412/1270	4.75	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.55	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.19	4.05	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 3
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0 Under-grad 7 Non-major 4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 0		