

Course-Section: LLC 600 01
 Title Lang, Lit, & Culture
 Instructor: Bickel, Beverly
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 904
 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	1	0	5	4.67	408/1447	4.67	4.81	4.31	4.46	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	766/1447	4.33	4.59	4.27	4.30	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.67	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1402	4.83	4.68	4.24	4.29	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	237/1358	4.67	4.82	4.11	4.26	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	239/1316	4.67	4.72	4.14	4.34	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	866/1427	4.17	4.48	4.19	4.25	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.98	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	278/1434	4.60	4.53	4.10	4.21	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	656/1387	4.60	4.75	4.46	4.51	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.95	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	510/1386	4.60	4.74	4.32	4.43	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.83	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	186/1193	4.67	4.15	4.02	4.02	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	181/1172	4.80	4.88	4.15	4.32	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	303/1182	4.80	4.93	4.35	4.46	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.90	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.80	4.06	4.10	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	30/ 66	4.80	4.85	4.58	4.71	4.80
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 62	5.00	4.83	4.56	4.69	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 58	5.00	4.86	4.41	4.75	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	34/ 65	4.60	4.75	4.42	4.64	4.60
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	36/ 64	4.00	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 601 01
 Title Pragmatics
 Instructor: Provencher,Deni
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 905
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	201/1447	4.86	4.81	4.31	4.46	4.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	217/1447	4.79	4.59	4.27	4.30	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.67	4.33	4.38	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	259/1402	4.71	4.68	4.24	4.29	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	201/1358	4.71	4.82	4.11	4.26	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.72	4.14	4.34	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	459/1427	4.50	4.48	4.19	4.25	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	388/1447	4.93	4.98	4.69	4.74	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	270/1434	4.62	4.53	4.10	4.21	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	276/1387	4.86	4.75	4.46	4.51	4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.95	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	366/1386	4.71	4.74	4.32	4.43	4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	299/1380	4.79	4.83	4.32	4.38	4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	2	4	4	3	3.62	921/1193	3.62	4.15	4.02	4.02	3.62
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.88	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.93	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	275/1170	4.86	4.90	4.38	4.52	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	217/ 800	4.46	4.80	4.06	4.10	4.46
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	35/ 66	4.75	4.85	4.58	4.71	4.75
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	34/ 62	4.75	4.83	4.56	4.69	4.75
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	23/ 58	4.75	4.86	4.41	4.75	4.75
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 65	5.00	4.75	4.42	4.64	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	4.33	4.09	4.18	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.72	4.85	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.57	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.56	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 7	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 7	Non-major 13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	7	3.50-4.00	6	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

Course-Section: LLC 650 01
 Title Adv Qualitative Method
 Instructor: Mallinson,Chris
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 906
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.81	4.31	4.46	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	196/1447	4.80	4.59	4.27	4.30	4.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1241	****	4.67	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	165/1402	4.80	4.68	4.24	4.29	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.82	4.11	4.26	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1316	5.00	4.72	4.14	4.34	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1427	5.00	4.48	4.19	4.25	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.98	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	341/1434	4.50	4.53	4.10	4.21	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.75	4.46	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	784/1387	4.80	4.95	4.73	4.81	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1386	5.00	4.74	4.32	4.43	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1380	5.00	4.83	4.32	4.38	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1193	5.00	4.15	4.02	4.02	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.88	4.15	4.32	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.93	4.35	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.90	4.38	4.52	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.80	4.06	4.10	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	3	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	4.85	4.58	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.83	4.56	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	4.86	4.41	4.75	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.75	4.42	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 64	****	4.33	4.09	4.18	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 38	5.00	5.00	4.49	4.77	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 36	5.00	5.00	4.25	4.39	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 28	5.00	5.00	4.52	4.83	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	5.00	4.30	4.66	5.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 27	5.00	5.00	4.43	4.71	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LLC 750 03
 Title Topics In LLC
 Instructor: Galindo,Claudia
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 907
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	342/1447	4.73	4.81	4.31	4.46	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	619/1447	4.44	4.59	4.27	4.30	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/1241	****	4.67	4.33	4.38	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	655/1402	4.36	4.68	4.24	4.29	4.36
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	87/1358	4.91	4.82	4.11	4.26	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	188/1316	4.73	4.72	4.14	4.34	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	751/1427	4.27	4.48	4.19	4.25	4.27
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.98	4.69	4.74	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	454/1434	4.40	4.53	4.10	4.21	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	741/1387	4.55	4.75	4.46	4.51	4.55
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.95	4.73	4.81	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	470/1386	4.64	4.74	4.32	4.43	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	615/1380	4.55	4.83	4.32	4.38	4.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	3.33	1022/1193	3.33	4.15	4.02	4.02	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	240/1172	4.73	4.88	4.15	4.32	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	198/1182	4.91	4.93	4.35	4.46	4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	427/1170	4.73	4.90	4.38	4.52	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	0	7	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	4.75	4.80	4.06	4.10	4.75
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 66	5.00	4.85	4.58	4.71	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	37/ 62	4.73	4.83	4.56	4.69	4.73
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	20/ 58	4.82	4.86	4.41	4.75	4.82
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	33/ 65	4.64	4.75	4.42	4.64	4.64
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	36/ 64	4.00	4.33	4.09	4.18	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors	3	Graduate 5	Major 4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 0				
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	0	Under-grad 6	Non-major 7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 0	D 0				
Grad.	5	3.50-4.00 10	F 0	Electives	7	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0				
			I 0	Other	1		
			? 0				