

Course-Section: LING 210 0101
 Title INTRO TO LANG STRUCTUR
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1098
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	6	13	4.60	485/1674	4.60	4.23	4.27	4.32	4.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	460/1674	4.60	4.26	4.23	4.26	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	335/1423	4.70	4.36	4.27	4.36	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	397/1609	4.58	4.23	4.22	4.23	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	204/1585	4.70	4.04	3.96	3.91	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	6	9	4.33	578/1535	4.33	4.08	4.08	4.03	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	175/1651	4.80	4.20	4.18	4.20	4.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	11	4.58	1155/1673	4.58	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	871/1656	4.13	4.06	4.07	4.10	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	389/1586	4.80	4.43	4.43	4.48	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	567/1585	4.90	4.72	4.69	4.76	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	525/1582	4.60	4.30	4.26	4.35	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	15	4.75	359/1575	4.75	4.32	4.27	4.39	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	8	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	489/1380	4.25	3.94	3.94	4.03	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	598/1520	4.30	4.14	4.01	4.03	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.28	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	358/1511	4.80	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	7	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 994	****	3.97	3.94	3.98	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 278	****	4.21	4.19	4.36	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 260	****	4.43	4.46	4.51	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 259	****	4.21	4.33	4.42	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 103	****	4.39	4.41	4.07	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 95	****	4.15	4.31	4.33	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 99	****	4.36	4.39	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	3.76	4.14	4.63	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	3.36	3.98	3.97	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 77	****	3.65	3.93	4.20	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.27	4.82	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 61	****	4.03	4.09	4.23	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.21	4.26	4.53	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.23	4.44	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	11	
?	1			

Course-Section: LING 450 0101
 Title APPLIED LINGUISTICS
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1099
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	215/1674	4.80	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	203/1423	4.80	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	173/1609	4.80	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	934/1651	4.20	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1463/1673	4.20	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1582	5.00	4.30	4.26	4.31	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1575	5.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	426/1380	4.33	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	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	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	5
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
					Other
					4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LING 490 0101
 Title SEM IN APPLIED LING
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1100
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.23	4.27	4.42	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.31	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1423	5.00	4.36	4.27	4.34	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1609	5.00	4.23	4.22	4.30	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.04	3.96	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1535	5.00	4.08	4.08	4.18	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1072/1673	4.67	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	4.19	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	438/1582	4.67	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	495/1575	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1036/1380	3.50	3.94	3.94	4.04	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.14	4.01	4.18	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1515	5.00	4.37	4.24	4.40	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1511	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.45	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 994	5.00	3.97	3.94	4.19	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	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 3
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
			? 0		

Course-Section: LING 494 0101
 Title ESL/FL TEACHERS:SYNTAX
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2005

Page 1101
 JAN 21, 2006
 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	5	13	4.72	331/1674	4.72	4.23	4.27	4.42	4.72	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	248/1674	4.78	4.26	4.23	4.31	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	322/1423	4.71	4.36	4.27	4.34	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	312/1609	4.67	4.23	4.22	4.30	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	283/1585	4.57	4.04	3.96	4.01	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	373/1535	4.50	4.08	4.08	4.18	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	157/1651	4.83	4.20	4.18	4.23	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	283/1656	4.64	4.06	4.07	4.19	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.46	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1585	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.76	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	286/1582	4.78	4.30	4.26	4.31	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	246/1575	4.83	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	603/1380	4.13	3.94	3.94	4.04	4.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	786/1520	4.07	4.14	4.01	4.18	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	1	4	7	4.14	971/1515	4.14	4.37	4.24	4.40	4.14	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	642/1511	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.45	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	287/ 994	4.40	3.97	3.94	4.19	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 2	A 14	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		Graduate 5
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	14
			? 1		