

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 619
 JUN 26, 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	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.05	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.15	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.18	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	226/1476	4.75	4.17	4.22	4.09	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	167/1412	4.75	4.01	4.06	4.01	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.07	4.08	3.93	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	312/1500	4.67	4.01	4.18	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	802/1517	4.75	4.69	4.65	4.62	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	264/1497	4.67	3.90	4.11	4.02	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.39	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.45	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	350/1432	4.75	4.09	4.29	4.23	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	124/1221	4.75	3.88	3.93	3.86	4.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	390/1280	4.50	4.36	4.10	3.92	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	804/1277	4.25	4.34	4.34	4.13	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	194/ 854	4.50	4.12	4.02	3.87	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 4	Non-major 4
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 042 8011
 Title ESL:READING & VOCAB DE
 Instructor: TAYLOR, PAUL
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 620
 JUN 26, 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	0	2.50	1512/1522	2.50	4.05	4.30	4.14	2.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1481/1522	3.00	4.15	4.26	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1248/1285	3.00	4.18	4.30	4.22	3.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1416/1476	3.00	4.17	4.22	4.09	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1327/1412	3.00	4.01	4.06	4.01	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1350/1381	2.50	4.07	4.08	3.93	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1430/1500	3.00	4.01	4.18	4.16	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1080/1517	4.50	4.69	4.65	4.62	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1404/1440	3.00	4.39	4.45	4.40	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1419/1448	3.50	4.45	4.71	4.63	3.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1378/1436	3.00	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1364/1432	3.00	4.09	4.29	4.23	3.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.88	3.93	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.36	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.34	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.12	4.02	3.87	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ELC 043 8010
 Title ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI
 Instructor: HOLM, GAIL P
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 621
 JUN 26, 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	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.05	4.30	4.14	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1522	5.00	4.15	4.26	4.18	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1285	5.00	4.18	4.30	4.22	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1476	5.00	4.17	4.22	4.09	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1412	5.00	4.01	4.06	4.01	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1381	5.00	4.07	4.08	3.93	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1500	5.00	4.01	4.18	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.69	4.65	4.62	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1440	5.00	4.39	4.45	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1448	5.00	4.45	4.71	4.63	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1436	5.00	4.20	4.29	4.24	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1432	5.00	4.09	4.29	4.23	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1221	5.00	3.88	3.93	3.86	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1280	5.00	4.36	4.10	3.92	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.34	4.34	4.13	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.53	4.31	4.04	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 854	5.00	4.12	4.02	3.87	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	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 3
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	0

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 622
 JUN 26, 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	1	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	1043/1522	4.17	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1200/1522	4.11	4.15	4.26	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	938/1285	4.19	4.18	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	703/1476	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	2	3	3.44	1201/1412	3.60	4.01	4.06	4.01	3.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	953/1381	4.01	4.07	4.08	3.93	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	3	0	4	2	3.56	1280/1500	3.94	4.01	4.18	4.16	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1517	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	3	2	3.83	1089/1497	3.70	3.90	4.11	4.02	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	1136/1440	4.42	4.39	4.45	4.40	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1253/1448	4.54	4.45	4.71	4.63	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1212/1436	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.24	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1191/1432	4.09	4.09	4.29	4.23	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	871/1221	3.59	3.88	3.93	3.86	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	849/1280	4.14	4.36	4.10	3.92	3.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1066/1277	4.23	4.34	4.34	4.13	3.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	875/1269	4.21	4.53	4.31	4.04	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	426/ 854	3.79	4.12	4.02	3.87	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	89/ 215	4.50	4.33	4.36	4.31	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	154/ 228	4.25	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.25	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.33	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	154/ 216	4.25	4.25	4.42	4.41	4.25	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	108/ 205	4.25	4.31	4.23	4.28	4.25	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	57/ 79	4.50	4.17	4.58	4.13	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	45/ 77	4.75	4.47	4.52	4.03	4.75	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	43/ 65	4.50	4.39	4.49	3.85	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 78	4.75	4.38	4.45	3.88	4.75	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	25/ 80	4.75	4.42	4.11	3.79	4.75	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	42/ 47	3.50	4.06	4.41	3.90	3.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	21/ 45	4.50	4.39	4.30	3.90	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	27/ 39	4.25	4.31	4.40	3.99	4.25	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	14/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	14/ 34	4.75	4.58	4.30	4.11	4.75	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	25/ 37	4.50	4.39	4.63	4.53	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	14/ 23	4.25	4.31	4.41	4.19	4.25	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	24/ 33	4.75	4.36	4.69	4.57	4.75	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	17/ 22	4.25	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.25	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	14/ 18	4.25	4.31	4.49	4.11	4.25	

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 622
 JUN 26, 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	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	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	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ELC 051 8030
 Title ESL:ADV WRITNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 623
 JUN 26, 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	0	4	4	4.22	929/1522	4.17	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	787/1522	4.11	4.15	4.26	4.18	4.33	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	674/1285	4.19	4.18	4.30	4.22	4.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	1009/1476	4.17	4.17	4.22	4.09	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1013/1412	3.60	4.01	4.06	4.01	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	4	3	4.13	733/1381	4.01	4.07	4.08	3.93	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	700/1500	3.94	4.01	4.18	4.16	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	973/1517	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1250/1497	3.70	3.90	4.11	4.02	3.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	532/1440	4.42	4.39	4.45	4.40	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	935/1448	4.54	4.45	4.71	4.63	4.71	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	696/1436	4.09	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	732/1432	4.09	4.09	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	860/1221	3.59	3.88	3.93	3.86	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	459/1280	4.14	4.36	4.10	3.92	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	421/1277	4.23	4.34	4.34	4.13	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	654/1269	4.21	4.53	4.31	4.04	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	658/ 854	3.79	4.12	4.02	3.87	3.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 1		Under-grad 9
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: ELC 052 8010
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 624
 JUN 26, 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	1	0	1	0	2	0	5	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1267/1522	4.00	4.15	4.26	4.18	3.75	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1053/1285	4.04	4.18	4.30	4.22	3.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	792/1476	4.38	4.17	4.22	4.09	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.01	4.06	4.01	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	604/1381	4.31	4.07	4.08	3.93	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	988/1500	4.06	4.01	4.18	4.16	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1517	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.62	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	898/1497	4.00	3.90	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	904/1440	4.50	4.39	4.45	4.40	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	1253/1448	4.62	4.45	4.71	4.63	4.38	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	972/1436	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1148/1432	4.14	4.09	4.29	4.23	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	3	3	4.00	606/1221	4.07	3.88	3.93	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	184/1280	4.40	4.36	4.10	3.92	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.34	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	816/1269	4.23	4.53	4.31	4.04	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	652/ 854	3.93	4.12	4.02	3.87	3.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 215	5.00	4.33	4.36	4.31	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	61/ 228	4.67	3.97	4.35	4.33	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 217	5.00	4.33	4.51	4.51	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 216	5.00	4.25	4.42	4.41	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	46/ 205	4.67	4.31	4.23	4.28	4.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 79	5.00	4.17	4.58	4.13	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	50/ 77	4.67	4.47	4.52	4.03	4.67	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 65	4.67	4.39	4.49	3.85	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.38	4.45	3.88	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 80	5.00	4.42	4.11	3.79	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 47	4.67	4.06	4.41	3.90	4.67	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	17/ 45	4.67	4.39	4.30	3.90	4.67	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	19/ 39	4.67	4.31	4.40	3.99	4.67	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.50	4.31	4.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.58	4.30	4.11	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 37	4.67	4.39	4.63	4.53	4.67	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	13/ 23	4.67	4.31	4.41	4.19	4.67	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	28/ 33	4.33	4.36	4.69	4.57	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	16/ 22	4.33	4.03	4.54	4.31	4.33	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	10/ 18	4.67	4.31	4.49	4.11	4.67	

Course-Section: ELC 052 8010
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: SIMS, DIANA
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 624
 JUN 26, 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	2	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
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	3				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ELC 052 8011
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 625
 JUN 26, 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	1	3	3	4.00	1122/1522	4.00	4.05	4.30	4.14	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	874/1522	4.00	4.15	4.26	4.18	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	766/1285	4.04	4.18	4.30	4.22	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	473/1476	4.38	4.17	4.22	4.09	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	566/1412	4.25	4.01	4.06	4.01	4.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4.38	470/1381	4.31	4.07	4.08	3.93	4.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	913/1500	4.06	4.01	4.18	4.16	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	973/1517	4.81	4.69	4.65	4.62	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	898/1497	4.00	3.90	4.11	4.02	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	716/1440	4.50	4.39	4.45	4.40	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	629/1448	4.62	4.45	4.71	4.63	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	845/1436	4.21	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	732/1432	4.14	4.09	4.29	4.23	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	540/1221	4.07	3.88	3.93	3.86	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	718/1280	4.40	4.36	4.10	3.92	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.34	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	777/1269	4.23	4.53	4.31	4.04	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	330/ 854	3.93	4.12	4.02	3.87	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	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 1	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 8 Non-major 8
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	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: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 626
 JUN 26, 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	2	0	2	3.60	1365/1522	3.60	4.05	4.30	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1080/1522	4.00	4.15	4.26	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	938/1285	4.00	4.18	4.30	4.22	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1324/1476	3.50	4.17	4.22	4.09	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	0	3.60	1112/1412	3.60	4.01	4.06	4.01	3.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1198/1381	3.40	4.07	4.08	3.93	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1357/1500	3.40	4.01	4.18	4.16	3.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1389/1517	4.00	4.69	4.65	4.62	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1346/1497	3.33	3.90	4.11	4.02	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	1047/1440	4.25	4.39	4.45	4.40	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1402/1448	3.75	4.45	4.71	4.63	3.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1056/1436	4.00	4.20	4.29	4.24	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1270/1432	3.50	4.09	4.29	4.23	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1064/1221	3.00	3.88	3.93	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1106/1280	3.33	4.36	4.10	3.92	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	930/1277	4.00	4.34	4.34	4.13	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	721/1269	4.33	4.53	4.31	4.04	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	779/ 854	3.00	4.12	4.02	3.87	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	202/ 215	3.50	4.33	4.36	4.31	3.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	220/ 228	3.00	3.97	4.35	4.33	3.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	211/ 217	3.00	4.33	4.51	4.51	3.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	197/ 216	3.50	4.25	4.42	4.41	3.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	141/ 205	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.28	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	75/ 79	3.00	4.17	4.58	4.13	3.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	59/ 77	4.00	4.47	4.52	4.03	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	54/ 65	4.00	4.39	4.49	3.85	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	64/ 78	4.00	4.38	4.45	3.88	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	62/ 80	3.50	4.42	4.11	3.79	3.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	34/ 47	4.00	4.06	4.41	3.90	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	30/ 45	4.00	4.39	4.30	3.90	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.31	4.40	3.99	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 35	4.50	4.50	4.31	4.00	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	22/ 34	4.00	4.58	4.30	4.11	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	31/ 37	4.00	4.39	4.63	4.53	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	15/ 23	4.00	4.31	4.41	4.19	4.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	29/ 33	4.00	4.36	4.69	4.57	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	19/ 22	3.50	4.03	4.54	4.31	3.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	15/ 18	4.00	4.31	4.49	4.11	4.00	

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: CHASE, JUDITH
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2007

Page 626
 JUN 26, 2007
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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