

Course Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 652
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	4	2	4.00	1173/1669	3.65	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1257/1666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1181/1421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1196/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	963/1555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1043/1543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1517/1647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1106/1668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	918/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	799/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	1193/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	753/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1069/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	0	5	0	3.67	846/1311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1038/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	479/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	1.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	1.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	2.40	3.20	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	3.33	3.33	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 652
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 653
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	4	2	4.00	1173/1669	3.65	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1257/1666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1181/1421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1196/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	963/1555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1043/1543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1517/1647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1106/1668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1069/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1115/1311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1038/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	479/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	1.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	1.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	2.40	3.20	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	3.33	3.33	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 653
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 654
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	4	2	4.00	1173/1669	3.65	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1257/1666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1181/1421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1196/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	963/1555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1043/1543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1517/1647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1106/1668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	799/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1404/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1066/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1319/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	587/1311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1038/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	479/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	1.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	1.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	2.40	3.20	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	3.33	3.33	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 654
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 655
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	4	2	4.00	1173/1669	3.65	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1257/1666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	1	2	3.63	1181/1421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1196/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	3	3.88	963/1555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	1043/1543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	2	3.13	1517/1647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	1106/1668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1199/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1193/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1330/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.09	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	642/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	939/1311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	742/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1013/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1038/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	479/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	1.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	1.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	2.40	3.20	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 33	3.33	3.33	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 655
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ELC 041 8030
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 656
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	2	1	0	2.33	1660/1669	3.65	3.97	4.23	4.02	2.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	2	1	0	2.33	1648/1666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	2.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1401/1421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	2.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	1591/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	2.50	1521/1555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	2.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	3	0	2.83	1476/1543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	2.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	0	2	3.17	1510/1647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1568/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	2.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1352/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	3.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	2.83	1545/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	2.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	1	1	0	2.17	1485/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	2.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	2.00	1490/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	2.20	1264/1311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	2.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	1.67	1486/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	1.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2.83	1434/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	2.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	2.67	1454/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	2.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	****	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	233/ 233	1.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	1.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	56/ 58	1.33	1.29	4.22	4.00	1.33	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	52/ 52	1.33	1.67	4.06	3.81	1.33	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	0	1	1	2.50	53/ 55	2.50	2.63	4.34	4.17	2.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	2	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	41/ 42	2.75	3.54	4.31	4.08	2.75	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	1	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	46/ 46	2.40	3.20	4.45	4.26	2.40	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	3	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	27/ 33	3.33	3.33	4.25	4.25	3.33	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	17/ 29	4.00	3.75	4.34	4.22	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ELC 041 8031
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 657
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	4	5	1	3.55	1462/1669	3.65	3.97	4.23	4.02	3.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	1	3.36	1520/1666	3.53	4.01	4.19	4.11	3.36	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	5	3	1	3.30	1298/1421	3.40	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.30	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	9	0	1	3.00	1516/1617	3.49	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	1	3	3.45	1265/1555	3.58	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	2	2	3.27	1339/1543	3.60	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	4	3	1	3.10	1521/1647	3.13	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1668	4.75	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	3	4	0	3.11	1493/1605	3.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	3.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1303/1514	4.08	4.33	4.39	4.32	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	5	2	3.82	1460/1551	4.03	4.42	4.66	4.55	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	8	0	2	3.18	1404/1503	3.62	4.07	4.24	4.17	3.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	1	2	3.09	1398/1506	3.52	4.01	4.26	4.17	3.09	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	3	4	1	0	2.40	1245/1311	3.13	3.77	3.85	3.68	2.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	4	1	0	2.63	1421/1490	3.52	3.86	4.05	3.85	2.63	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	2	0	2	3	1	3.13	1388/1502	3.66	3.93	4.26	4.06	3.13	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	3	1	3	1	0	2.25	1477/1489	3.49	3.93	4.29	4.07	2.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	4	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	997/1006	3.60	3.95	4.00	3.81	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 11
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course Section: ELC 042 8010
 Title ESL:READING & VOCAB DE
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 658
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	4	2	4.14	1052/1669	4.01	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.14	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1094/1666	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	3.71	1148/1421	4.00	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	922/1617	4.21	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	773/1555	4.41	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	895/1543	4.31	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	2	0	2	3.33	1474/1647	3.69	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	4.88	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	4.00	918/1605	4.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	715/1514	4.39	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	954/1551	4.72	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	491/1503	4.47	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.57	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1209/1506	4.15	4.01	4.26	4.17	3.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	587/1311	3.84	3.77	3.85	3.68	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	445/1490	4.17	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	880/1502	4.14	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	1038/1489	4.33	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	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 1	General 0	Under-grad 7 Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 2	
			? 1		

Course Section: ELC 042 8011
 Title ESL:READING & VOCAB DE
 Instructor: VALAIS, TERESA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 659
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	1173/1669	4.01	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	549/1666	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	557/1421	4.00	3.86	4.24	4.11	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	641/1617	4.21	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	128/1555	4.41	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	130/1543	4.31	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	651/1647	3.69	3.73	4.12	4.06	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	844/1668	4.88	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	499/1605	4.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	799/1514	4.39	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	4.72	4.42	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1503	4.47	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	249/1506	4.15	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	333/1311	3.84	3.77	3.85	3.68	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	622/1490	4.17	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	632/1502	4.14	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	348/1489	4.33	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	424/1006	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	192/ 226	3.50	3.50	4.20	3.98	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	146/ 233	4.00	2.50	4.19	4.09	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	209/ 225	3.75	3.75	4.50	4.42	3.75	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	164/ 223	4.00	4.00	4.35	4.19	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	56/ 206	4.67	4.67	4.15	4.01	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 112	****	****	4.38	4.04	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 97	****	****	4.36	4.19	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	1.00	4.22	3.79	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	72/ 105	4.00	4.00	4.20	3.94	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	46/ 98	4.00	4.00	3.95	3.90	4.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	57/ 58	1.25	1.29	4.22	4.00	1.25	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	2.00	48/ 52	2.00	1.67	4.06	3.81	2.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	3	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	34/ 40	3.00	3.00	3.97	4.00	3.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	52/ 55	2.75	2.63	4.34	4.17	2.75	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 42	4.33	3.54	4.31	4.08	4.33	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	2	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	31/ 46	4.00	3.20	4.45	4.26	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	3.33	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	23/ 29	3.50	3.75	4.34	4.22	3.50	

Course Section: ELC 042 8011
 Title ESL:READING & VOCAB DE
 Instructor: VALAIS, TERESA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 659
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	6	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	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				
				?	1						

Course Section: ELC 042 8012
 Title ESL:READING & VOCAB DE
 Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 660
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	3	5	2	3.90	1288/1669	4.01	3.97	4.23	4.02	3.90	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	1037/1666	4.20	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.10	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	3	3.80	1118/1421	4.00	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	970/1617	4.21	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.10	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	438/1555	4.41	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	832/1543	4.31	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.10	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	4	4	0	3.33	1474/1647	3.69	3.73	4.12	4.06	3.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	901/1668	4.88	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	830/1605	4.17	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	1166/1514	4.39	4.33	4.39	4.32	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1239/1551	4.72	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1066/1503	4.47	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1236/1506	4.15	4.01	4.26	4.17	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	3	3	2	1	3.11	1100/1311	3.84	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1088/1490	4.17	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1253/1502	4.14	3.93	4.26	4.06	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	973/1489	4.33	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	632/1006	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.81	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 10 Non-major 10
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	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 051 8030
 Title ESL:ADV WRITNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 661
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	6	4.75	269/1669	4.75	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	142/1666	4.86	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1421	4.67	3.86	4.24	4.11	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	673/1617	4.38	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	285/1555	4.57	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.57	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	210/1543	4.71	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	250/1647	4.71	3.73	4.12	4.06	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	298/1605	4.60	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.42	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	191/1503	4.83	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	471/1506	4.67	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.77	3.85	3.68	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1215/1490	3.40	3.86	4.05	3.85	3.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1279/1502	3.60	3.93	4.26	4.06	3.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	0	1	2	3.40	1318/1489	3.40	3.93	4.29	4.07	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	178/1006	4.67	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	2.50	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.00	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.01	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	1.29	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	2.63	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.54	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.20	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	3.33	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	3.75	4.34	4.22	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	4	
?	0			

Course Section: ELC 052 8010
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 662
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	769/1669	4.38	3.97	4.23	4.02	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	412/1666	4.63	4.01	4.19	4.11	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	746/1421	4.33	3.86	4.24	4.11	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	496/1617	4.50	3.95	4.15	3.99	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	461/1555	4.38	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	390/1543	4.50	4.01	4.06	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	345/1647	4.63	3.73	4.12	4.06	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	499/1605	4.40	3.94	4.07	3.96	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.42	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	323/1503	4.71	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	225/1506	4.86	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	104/1311	4.83	3.77	3.85	3.68	4.83	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	849/1490	4.00	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	920/1502	4.20	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	800/1489	4.40	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	407/1006	4.20	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 226	****	3.50	4.20	3.98	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	2.50	4.19	4.09	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	3.75	4.50	4.42	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 223	****	4.00	4.35	4.19	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 206	****	4.67	4.15	4.01	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 105	****	4.00	4.20	3.94	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 98	****	4.00	3.95	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	1.29	4.22	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	1.67	4.06	3.81	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	****	4.39	4.30	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	3.00	3.97	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.33	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	2.63	4.34	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	3.54	4.31	4.08	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	****	3.20	4.45	4.26	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 33	****	3.33	4.25	4.25	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 29	****	3.75	4.34	4.22	****	

Course Section: ELC 052 8010
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 662
 JAN 18, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: CHASE, JUDITH
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 663
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	1	1	2	3	3	3.60	1437/1669	3.60	3.97	4.23	4.02	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	3	4	3.90	1235/1666	3.90	4.01	4.19	4.11	3.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1118/1421	3.80	3.86	4.24	4.11	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1168/1617	3.90	3.95	4.15	3.99	3.90	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1227/1555	3.50	3.97	4.00	3.92	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1294/1543	3.43	4.01	4.06	3.86	3.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	806/1647	4.30	3.73	4.12	4.06	4.30	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	901/1668	4.80	4.84	4.67	4.62	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1428/1605	3.33	3.94	4.07	3.96	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	1369/1514	3.60	4.33	4.39	4.32	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	2	0	2	6	4.20	1361/1551	4.20	4.42	4.66	4.55	4.20	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	4	3	3.70	1261/1503	3.70	4.07	4.24	4.17	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	4	4.10	1025/1506	4.10	4.01	4.26	4.17	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	4	3	3.89	712/1311	3.89	3.77	3.85	3.68	3.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	742/1490	4.20	3.86	4.05	3.85	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	754/1502	4.40	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.40	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	800/1489	4.40	3.93	4.29	4.07	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	479/1006	4.00	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.00	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	2.50	4.19	4.09	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course Section: ELC 054 8010
 Title ESL:X-CULTURAL COMMUNC
 Instructor: CHASE, JUDITH
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2006

Page 664
 JAN 18, 2007
 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	2	5.00	1/1669	5.00	3.97	4.23	4.02	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1666	5.00	4.01	4.19	4.11	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	5.00	3.86	4.24	4.11	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1617	5.00	3.95	4.15	3.99	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	340/1555	4.50	3.97	4.00	3.92	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1543	5.00	4.01	4.06	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1647	5.00	3.73	4.12	4.06	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1668	5.00	4.84	4.67	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1605	5.00	3.94	4.07	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1514	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.32	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1551	5.00	4.42	4.66	4.55	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1503	4.50	4.07	4.24	4.17	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.01	4.26	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1311	5.00	3.77	3.85	3.68	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1490	5.00	3.86	4.05	3.85	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	632/1502	4.50	3.93	4.26	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.93	4.29	4.07	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	235/1006	4.50	3.95	4.00	3.81	4.50	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	92/ 92	1.00	1.00	4.22	3.79	1.00	

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 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 2
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0		
			? 0		