

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010  
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 689  
 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	2	0	2	1	4	3.56	1495/1674	3.85	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	968/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	2	6	4.33	771/1423	4.10	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	1018/1609	3.91	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.11	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	224/1585	4.48	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	1039/1535	3.94	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	458/1651	4.21	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1330/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	3.96	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1300/1586	4.21	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	1448/1585	4.21	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	1061/1582	4.06	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	1225/1575	3.94	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	4	2	2	3.44	1070/1380	3.65	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	760/1520	3.90	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1209/1515	3.88	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1004/1511	4.23	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.13	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	474/ 994	4.25	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 041 8011  
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR  
 Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE  
 Enrollment: 16  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 690  
 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	9	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1075/1674	3.85	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	9	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	894/1674	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	9	0	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	1131/1423	4.10	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	9	0	0	2	1	1	3	3.71	1348/1609	3.91	4.23	4.22	4.05	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	530/1585	4.48	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	870/1535	3.94	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	9	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1258/1651	4.21	4.20	4.18	4.10	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	9	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1673	5.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	522/1656	4.00	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	974/1586	4.21	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	1383/1585	4.21	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	1129/1582	4.06	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	1138/1575	3.94	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	9	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	831/1380	3.65	3.94	3.94	3.78	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1092/1520	3.90	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	1024/1515	3.88	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	816/1511	4.23	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	205/ 994	4.25	3.97	3.94	3.73	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 3	A 4	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010  
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA  
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 691  
 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	2	0	0	2	2	2	5	3.91	1322/1674	3.91	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.91	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	1009/1674	4.18	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	636/1423	4.45	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	701/1609	4.36	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	1	2	5	3.64	1223/1535	3.64	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	727/1651	4.36	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	352/1656	4.55	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	618/1586	4.70	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	1191/1585	4.55	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	914/1582	4.27	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.27	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	1103/1575	4.09	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	472/1380	4.27	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	1	5	3.73	1051/1520	3.73	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	1	2	4	3.36	1352/1515	3.36	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	1021/1511	4.09	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	699/ 994	3.60	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	1	0	2	1	3	3.71	219/ 265	3.71	4.06	4.23	3.97	3.71	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	211/ 278	3.88	4.21	4.19	3.97	3.88	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	215/ 260	4.00	4.43	4.46	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	159/ 259	4.25	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	150/ 233	4.00	4.36	4.20	4.00	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	67/ 103	4.33	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	48/ 101	4.71	4.33	4.48	4.18	4.71	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	43/ 95	4.50	4.15	4.31	3.99	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	59/ 99	4.33	4.36	4.39	4.10	4.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	2	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	38/ 97	4.50	3.76	4.14	3.69	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	3	0	0	3	2	3.13	57/ 76	3.13	3.36	3.98	3.32	3.13	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	1	1	3	2	3.50	50/ 77	3.50	3.65	3.93	3.42	3.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	2	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	29/ 53	4.50	4.19	4.45	4.34	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	26/ 48	4.00	3.86	4.12	4.00	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	32/ 49	4.14	3.74	4.27	4.30	4.14	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	29/ 61	4.00	4.03	4.09	3.87	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	28/ 52	4.13	4.21	4.26	3.91	4.13	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	35/ 50	4.25	4.23	4.44	4.39	4.25	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	1	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	20/ 35	4.43	4.22	4.36	3.92	4.43	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	19/ 31	4.14	4.25	4.34	3.88	4.14	

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010  
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA  
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 691  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 052 8010  
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA  
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 692  
 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	2	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1385/1674	3.80	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	1077/1674	4.10	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	697/1423	4.40	4.36	4.27	4.16	4.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	930/1609	4.20	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	1006/1585	3.80	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	2	0	5	3.50	1295/1535	3.50	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	524/1651	4.50	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	1267/1673	4.44	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.44	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	381/1656	4.50	4.06	4.07	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	858/1586	4.50	4.43	4.43	4.37	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	998/1582	4.20	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	1	5	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	540/1380	4.20	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	2	1	4	3.60	1129/1520	3.60	4.14	4.01	3.76	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	2	2	1	1	4	3.30	1370/1515	3.30	4.37	4.24	3.97	3.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	7	4.20	955/1511	4.20	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	2	1	1	3	2	3.22	842/ 994	3.22	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	1	1	0	3	0	3	3.57	225/ 265	3.57	4.06	4.23	3.97	3.57	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	2	2	1	3	3.63	232/ 278	3.63	4.21	4.19	3.97	3.63	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	237/ 260	3.83	4.43	4.46	4.41	3.83	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	159/ 259	4.25	4.21	4.33	4.19	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	1	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	176/ 233	3.86	4.36	4.20	4.00	3.86	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	74/ 103	4.00	4.39	4.41	4.33	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	42/ 101	4.83	4.33	4.48	4.18	4.83	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	60/ 95	4.17	4.15	4.31	3.99	4.17	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	2	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	70/ 99	4.00	4.36	4.39	4.10	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	2	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	50/ 97	4.00	3.76	4.14	3.69	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	1	3	1	2.88	66/ 76	2.88	3.36	3.98	3.32	2.88	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	1	1	2	2	2	3.38	57/ 77	3.38	3.65	3.93	3.42	3.38	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	1	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	37/ 53	4.29	4.19	4.45	4.34	4.29	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	2	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	35/ 48	3.67	3.86	4.12	4.00	3.67	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	34/ 49	4.00	3.74	4.27	4.30	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	42/ 61	3.75	4.03	4.09	3.87	3.75	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	37/ 52	3.88	4.21	4.26	3.91	3.88	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	1	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	42/ 50	3.86	4.23	4.44	4.39	3.86	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	22/ 35	4.14	4.22	4.36	3.92	4.14	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	24/ 31	3.86	4.25	4.34	3.88	3.86	

Course-Section: ELC 052 8010  
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA  
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 12  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 692  
 JAN 21, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	1	A	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	5	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010  
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN  
 Instructor: CHINNERY, GEORG  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 693  
 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	1	0	4.00	1196/1674	4.00	4.23	4.27	4.07	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1146/1674	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.16	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	769/1585	4.00	4.04	3.96	3.88	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	870/1535	4.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1651	5.00	4.20	4.18	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1566/1673	4.00	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1539/1586	3.00	4.43	4.43	4.37	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1574/1585	3.00	4.72	4.69	4.60	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1129/1582	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1575	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	810/1520	4.00	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 063 8010  
 Title ESL TOP II:SPEAK&LISTE  
 Instructor: CHINNERY, GEORG  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2005

Page 694  
 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	1	0	3.50	1511/1674	3.50	4.23	4.27	4.07	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1674	5.00	4.26	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1363/1423	3.00	4.36	4.27	4.16	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1094/1609	4.00	4.23	4.22	4.05	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1223/1585	3.50	4.04	3.96	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1435/1535	3.00	4.08	4.08	3.89	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1097/1651	4.00	4.20	4.18	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1203/1673	4.50	4.65	4.69	4.67	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1656	5.00	4.06	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1586	5.00	4.43	4.43	4.37	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1225/1585	4.50	4.72	4.69	4.60	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1582	4.50	4.30	4.26	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1367/1575	3.50	4.32	4.27	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	666/1380	4.00	3.94	3.94	3.78	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	397/1520	4.50	4.14	4.01	3.76	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1024/1515	4.00	4.37	4.24	3.97	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1050/1511	4.00	4.37	4.27	4.00	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	732/ 994	3.50	3.97	3.94	3.73	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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