

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 640
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	2	0	3	3.67	1416/1639	3.53	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1481/1639	3.55	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1268/1397	3.45	3.78	4.28	4.18	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	0	3	3.50	1406/1583	3.13	3.85	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1241/1532	3.45	3.84	4.01	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	990/1504	3.62	4.05	4.05	3.78	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1488/1612	3.20	3.77	4.16	4.10	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1635	4.70	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	1162/1518	3.98	4.17	4.43	4.38	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	1414/1520	4.00	4.27	4.70	4.61	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	1	1	2	3.33	1405/1517	3.57	4.42	4.27	4.20	3.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	3.50	1328/1550	3.55	3.96	4.22	4.17	3.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	838/1295	3.28	3.67	3.94	3.84	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	929/1398	3.57	3.93	4.07	3.85	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	983/1391	3.83	4.04	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	872/1388	3.93	4.28	4.28	4.01	4.20	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	201/ 958	3.25	3.74	3.93	3.71	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 041 8011
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: DRAGANESCU, MAR
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 641
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	0	1	3.40	1530/1639	3.53	4.12	4.27	4.08	3.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	3.60	1444/1639	3.55	4.28	4.22	4.17	3.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1300/1397	3.45	3.78	4.28	4.18	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	2.75	1569/1583	3.13	3.85	4.19	4.01	2.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1300/1532	3.45	3.84	4.01	3.88	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	3.40	1259/1504	3.62	4.05	4.05	3.78	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	0	1	3.20	1488/1612	3.20	3.77	4.16	4.10	3.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	1235/1635	4.70	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1351/1518	3.98	4.17	4.43	4.38	3.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1414/1520	4.00	4.27	4.70	4.61	4.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1241/1517	3.57	4.42	4.27	4.20	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	1297/1550	3.55	3.96	4.22	4.17	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	2.80	1213/1295	3.28	3.67	3.94	3.84	2.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1183/1398	3.57	3.93	4.07	3.85	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1177/1391	3.83	4.04	4.30	4.07	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1130/1388	3.93	4.28	4.28	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	2.00	937/ 958	3.25	3.74	3.93	3.71	2.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 043 8010
 Title ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI
 Instructor: HOLM, GAIL P
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 642
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1/1639	5.00	4.12	4.27	4.08	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	973/1397	4.00	3.78	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.85	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1241/1532	3.50	3.84	4.01	3.88	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.05	4.05	3.78	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1612	5.00	3.77	4.16	4.10	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	807/1518	4.50	4.17	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.27	4.70	4.61	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	597/1517	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	3.96	4.22	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.67	3.94	3.84	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	426/1398	4.50	3.93	4.07	3.85	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.04	4.30	4.07	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.28	4.28	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	3.74	3.93	3.71	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010
 Title ESL:ADV WRITNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 643
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	4	4.33	814/1639	4.33	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	231/1639	4.78	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.78	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	925/1397	4.11	3.78	4.28	4.18	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	697/1583	4.33	3.85	4.19	4.01	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	305/1532	4.56	3.84	4.01	3.88	4.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	958/1504	3.89	4.05	4.05	3.78	3.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	439/1612	4.56	3.77	4.16	4.10	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	1101/1635	4.56	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.56	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	4.71	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	257/1518	4.88	4.17	4.43	4.38	4.88	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.27	4.70	4.61	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	173/1517	4.89	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	580/1550	4.56	3.96	4.22	4.17	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	505/1295	4.20	3.67	3.94	3.84	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	329/1398	4.67	3.93	4.07	3.85	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.04	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.78	4.28	4.28	4.01	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	3	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	399/ 958	4.17	3.74	3.93	3.71	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	8	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 82	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.12	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 78	4.67	4.67	4.47	4.25	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	2	A	5	Required for Majors	1	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	9	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 052 8010
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 644
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	3	1	7	4.17	990/1639	4.17	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	435/1639	4.58	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.58	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	973/1397	4.00	3.78	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	697/1583	4.33	3.85	4.19	4.01	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	388/1532	4.45	3.84	4.01	3.88	4.45	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.05	4.05	3.78	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	617/1612	4.42	3.77	4.16	4.10	4.42	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	766/1635	4.83	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	262/1579	4.64	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.64	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1518	4.82	4.17	4.43	4.38	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.27	4.70	4.61	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	1038/1550	4.08	3.96	4.22	4.17	4.08	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	459/1295	4.25	3.67	3.94	3.84	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	397/1398	4.56	3.93	4.07	3.85	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	662/1391	4.44	4.04	4.30	4.07	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	496/1388	4.67	4.28	4.28	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	307/ 958	4.33	3.74	3.93	3.71	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	****	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	5.00	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.67	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	****	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	****	4.16	3.90	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	4	0.00-0.99 2	A 6	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 1 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: EDMONDS, LORI M
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 645
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	890/1639	4.25	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1090/1639	4.00	4.28	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1219/1397	3.67	3.78	4.28	4.18	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.85	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	335/1532	4.50	3.84	4.01	3.88	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1051/1504	3.75	4.05	4.05	3.78	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	3.77	4.16	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	382/1579	4.50	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.17	4.43	4.38	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	1188/1520	4.50	4.27	4.70	4.61	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.42	4.27	4.20	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	3.96	4.22	4.17	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	978/1295	3.50	3.67	3.94	3.84	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1030/1398	3.67	3.93	4.07	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1177/1391	3.67	4.04	4.30	4.07	3.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1130/1388	3.67	4.28	4.28	4.01	3.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	658/ 958	3.67	3.74	3.93	3.71	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	****	4.10	3.90	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	****	4.58	4.50	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.67	4.47	4.25	****	
Field Work															
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	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	5	Non-major	5
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	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 061 8050
 Title ESL TOP I :ACAD WRITIN
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 5
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 646
 FEB 13, 2008
 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	1138/1639	4.00	4.12	4.27	4.08	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.28	4.22	4.17	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1010/1583	4.00	3.85	4.19	4.01	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.00	3.84	4.01	3.88	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.05	4.05	3.78	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1595/1612	2.00	3.77	4.16	4.10	2.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.00	4.54	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	889/1579	4.00	4.34	4.08	3.95	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1481/1518	3.00	4.17	4.43	4.38	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1512/1520	3.00	4.27	4.70	4.61	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	3.96	4.22	4.17	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1271/1398	3.00	3.93	4.07	3.85	3.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.04	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.28	4.28	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	456/ 958	4.00	3.74	3.93	3.71	4.00	

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		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	