

Course-Section: LING 290 01
 Title Intro To Applied Ling
 Instructor: Ka,Omar
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 900
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	8	2	4	3.60	1310/1447	3.60	4.31	4.31	4.31	3.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	4.13	965/1447	4.13	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1059/1241	3.79	4.48	4.33	4.35	3.79
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1113/1402	3.85	4.36	4.24	4.24	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	2	7	4	3.87	945/1358	3.87	4.26	4.11	4.12	3.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	2	2	3.00	1257/1316	3.00	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1271/1427	3.46	4.21	4.19	4.14	3.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	4	4.29	1234/1447	4.29	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	6	1	3.80	1052/1434	3.80	4.12	4.10	3.97	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	1105/1387	4.17	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	859/1387	4.75	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	1160/1386	3.83	4.35	4.32	4.24	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1297/1380	3.25	4.43	4.32	4.30	3.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	3	3	2	3.40	999/1193	3.40	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	496/1172	4.36	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.36
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	527/1182	4.55	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	501/1170	4.64	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.50
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	****	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	****	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 6			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 15	Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 1			

Course-Section: LING 350 01
 Title Historical Linguistics
 Instructor: McCray, Stanley
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 901
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	989/1447	4.13	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1241	4.83	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	854/1402	4.17	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	345/1358	4.50	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	812/1316	4.00	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	373/1427	4.57	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1361/1447	4.00	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	849/1434	4.00	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	1235/1387	3.88	4.45	4.46	4.44	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	1143/1387	4.50	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	988/1386	4.13	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	1	1	0	2	3.20	1050/1193	3.20	4.02	4.02	4.05	3.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	710/1172	4.00	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	798/1170	4.20	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	742/ 800	3.00	4.17	4.06	4.12	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors		5	Graduate	0	Major	6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0							
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General		2	Under-grad	9	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0							
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives		0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0							
				I	0	Other		0				
				?	1							

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	430/1447	4.64	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	376/1447	4.64	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	113/1241	4.92	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	281/1402	4.69	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.69
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	430/1358	4.43	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	512/1316	4.38	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	513/1427	4.46	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	5	4.38	1168/1447	4.38	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	105/1434	4.85	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.85
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	206/1386	4.85	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	127/1380	4.92	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	323/1193	4.46	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	309/1172	4.63	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	254/1170	4.88	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	780/ 800	2.60	4.17	4.06	4.12	2.60
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	3.81	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.46	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	4.42	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 8	Required for Majors	8	Graduate 0 Major 9
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 3			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	Under-grad 14 Non-major 5
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0			
			I 0	Other	2	
			? 2			

Course-Section: LING 450 01
 Title Applied Linguistics
 Instructor: Young, Steven R
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 903
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.31	4.31	4.43	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	292/1447	4.71	4.34	4.27	4.31	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1402	4.86	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1084/1358	3.67	4.26	4.11	4.15	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.27	4.14	4.27	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	739/1427	4.29	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	102/1434	4.86	4.12	4.10	4.17	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	****	4.45	4.46	4.48	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1387	****	4.78	4.73	4.76	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1386	****	4.35	4.32	4.34	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1380	****	4.43	4.32	4.34	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1172	****	4.26	4.15	4.25	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1182	****	4.56	4.35	4.49	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1170	****	4.41	4.38	4.51	****
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 800	****	4.17	4.06	4.19	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.68	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	16/ 36	4.40	4.70	4.25	4.42	4.40
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	4.72	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	22/ 30	4.00	4.00	4.30	4.38	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	3	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 27	4.50	4.50	4.43	4.62	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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