

Course-Section: LING 210 0101
 Title INTRO TO LANG STRUCTUR
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1016
 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	5	12	4.61	495/1639	4.61	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	306/1639	4.71	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	367/1397	4.67	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	392/1583	4.58	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.58	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	306/1504	4.59	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	340/1612	4.65	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	12	4	4.11	818/1579	4.11	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	4.61	670/1518	4.61	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.61	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	328/1520	4.94	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	572/1517	4.53	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	511/1550	4.61	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.61	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	1	2	2	5	3.82	798/1295	3.82	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	675/1398	4.20	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	328/1388	4.80	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	7	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	4.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 12	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	6	2.00-2.99 2	C 1	General	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 4	D 0		Under-grad 18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives	2
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	13
			? 1		

Course-Section: LING 320 0101
 Title SYNTAX
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1017
 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	3	2	12	4.53	593/1639	4.53	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	1003/1639	4.12	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.12	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	13	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1397	****	4.37	4.28	4.26	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	852/1583	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	141/1532	4.81	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.81	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	612/1504	4.25	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	5	3	5	3.56	1375/1612	3.56	4.02	4.16	4.12	3.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	11	4	4.06	1475/1635	4.06	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	847/1579	4.07	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	1094/1518	4.25	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	776/1520	4.81	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	7	4	5	3.88	1199/1517	3.88	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	5	7	4.06	1048/1550	4.06	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	12	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/1295	****	3.77	3.94	3.95	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	608/1398	4.27	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.27	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	727/1391	4.36	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.36	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	317/1388	4.82	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.82	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	7	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	3.97	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.08	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	7	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	5
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	15				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LING 490 0101
 Title SEM IN APPLIED LING
 Instructor: YOUNG, STEVEN
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1018
 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	2	2	6	4.40	754/1639	4.40	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	2	4	3.80	1326/1639	3.80	4.15	4.22	4.29	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	467/1397	4.56	4.37	4.28	4.38	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	761/1583	4.29	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	469/1532	4.38	4.10	4.01	4.07	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	130/1504	4.86	4.04	4.05	4.20	4.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	2	4	0	3.00	1519/1612	3.00	4.02	4.16	4.18	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1067/1635	4.60	4.38	4.65	4.72	4.60	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1200/1579	3.71	4.00	4.08	4.21	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1518	****	4.23	4.43	4.51	****	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1520	****	4.67	4.70	4.75	****	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	9	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1517	****	4.15	4.27	4.34	****	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/1550	****	4.27	4.22	4.24	****	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	965/1398	3.75	4.18	4.07	4.23	3.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.51	4.30	4.48	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.75	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	4.02	3.93	4.24	3.50	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	48/ 85	4.67	4.67	4.58	4.83	4.67	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	43/ 82	4.60	4.60	4.52	4.49	4.60	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	38/ 78	4.80	4.80	4.47	4.56	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	57/ 80	4.20	4.20	4.47	4.59	4.20	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	71/ 82	3.00	3.00	4.16	4.02	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0
				P	0
				I	0
				?	0
			Required for Majors	1	Graduate
			General	1	Under-grad
			Electives	0	Major
			Other	8	Non-major
					1

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LING 694 0101
 Title THE GRAMMAR OF AMERICA
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1019
 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	3	15	4.83	231/1639	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	77/1639	4.37	4.15	4.22	4.26	4.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	302/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.37	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	363/1583	4.14	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	10	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	335/1532	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.10	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	329/1504	3.84	4.04	4.05	4.29	4.56	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	249/1612	4.49	4.02	4.16	4.27	4.72	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	0	6	7	4.54	352/1579	3.85	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	416/1518	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.49	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	328/1520	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.79	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	535/1517	4.17	4.15	4.27	4.32	4.56	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	1	14	4.56	580/1550	3.94	4.27	4.22	4.23	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	11	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	623/1295	3.11	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	10	4.11	728/1398	3.72	4.18	4.07	4.22	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	1	1	3	12	4.33	752/1391	4.10	4.51	4.30	4.47	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	1	1	2	12	4.17	887/1388	3.78	4.35	4.28	4.49	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	10	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	544/ 958	3.19	4.02	3.93	4.01	3.88	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	3.96	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	A 12	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 6
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 1		

Course-Section: LING 694 8720
 Title THE GRAMMAR OF AMERICA
 Instructor: ~~NELSON, JOHN~~ TABAA, MARY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2007

Page 1020
 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	2	2	3	8	4.13	1029/1639	4.48	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	5	4	5	3.80	1326/1639	4.37	4.15	4.22	4.26	3.80	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	7	2	3.53	1262/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.37	3.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	1	5	5	3.67	1324/1583	4.14	4.18	4.19	4.31	3.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	0	5	2	5	3.77	1035/1532	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.10	3.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	4	3	3	3.13	1381/1504	3.84	4.04	4.05	4.29	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	0	2	10	4.27	802/1612	4.49	4.02	4.16	4.27	4.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.81	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	2	1	6	1	3.17	1448/1579	3.85	4.00	4.08	4.17	3.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	2	3	6	3.60	1404/1518	4.19	4.23	4.43	4.49	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	1273/1520	4.67	4.67	4.70	4.79	4.40	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	2	4	5	3.79	1248/1517	4.17	4.15	4.27	4.32	3.79	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	4	2	5	3.33	1385/1550	3.94	4.27	4.22	4.23	3.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	5	1	0	2	1	2.22	1267/1295	3.11	3.77	3.94	3.95	2.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	2	4	4	3.33	1183/1398	3.72	4.18	4.07	4.22	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	2	4	2	6	3.86	1094/1391	4.10	4.51	4.30	4.47	3.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	6	3	0	6	3.40	1226/1388	3.78	4.35	4.28	4.49	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	3	2	2	3	0	2.50	917/ 958	3.19	4.02	3.93	4.01	2.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.39	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.61	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.31	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	12				
				?	0						