

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 661
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	3	3.67	1429/1649	4.17	4.26	4.28	4.11	3.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	1054/1648	4.47	4.49	4.23	4.16	4.11	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	3	2	3.75	1112/1375	4.21	4.06	4.27	4.10	3.75	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1275/1595	4.22	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	935/1533	4.36	4.18	4.04	3.87	3.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1107/1512	4.31	4.40	4.10	3.86	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1318/1623	4.17	4.20	4.16	4.08	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	1037/1646	4.83	4.78	4.69	4.67	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1225/1621	4.27	4.32	4.06	3.96	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	791/1568	4.78	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	1289/1572	4.72	4.75	4.70	4.64	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	728/1564	4.72	4.59	4.28	4.20	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	512/1559	4.83	4.69	4.29	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	208/1352	4.58	4.29	3.98	3.86	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	228/1384	4.72	4.58	4.08	3.86	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	483/1382	4.50	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	310/ 948	4.58	4.01	3.95	3.75	4.33	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	129/ 221	4.40	4.32	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	110/ 243	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.08	4.33	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	126/ 212	4.57	4.28	4.40	4.43	4.33	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	72/ 209	4.73	4.49	4.35	4.38	4.67	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	338/ 555	4.67	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.33	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	60/ 88	4.67	4.37	4.54	4.31	4.33	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	67/ 85	4.00	4.25	4.47	4.30	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	35/ 81	4.67	4.72	4.43	4.39	4.67	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	86/ 92	3.67	4.21	4.35	4.01	3.33	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	58/ 288	4.33	4.61	3.68	3.54	4.33	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 52	4.75	4.25	4.06	3.72	5.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	25/ 48	4.00	3.88	4.09	3.65	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	23/ 39	4.17	4.11	4.47	4.36	4.33	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	22/ 39	4.33	4.67	4.38	4.37	4.33	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.00	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	30/ 53	4.17	4.33	4.30	4.17	4.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	7/ 30	4.08	4.29	4.16	4.06	4.67	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	25/ 41	4.17	4.46	4.43	4.27	4.33	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.75	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.50	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 661
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 041 8011
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: VALAIS, TERESA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 662
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	433/1649	4.17	4.26	4.28	4.11	4.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.47	4.49	4.23	4.16	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	401/1375	4.21	4.06	4.27	4.10	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	321/1595	4.22	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	137/1533	4.36	4.18	4.04	3.87	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	142/1512	4.31	4.40	4.10	3.86	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	321/1623	4.17	4.20	4.16	4.08	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1646	4.83	4.78	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	121/1621	4.27	4.32	4.06	3.96	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1568	4.78	4.74	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	4.72	4.75	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1564	4.72	4.59	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1559	4.83	4.69	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	303/1352	4.58	4.29	3.98	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	326/1384	4.72	4.58	4.08	3.86	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	774/1382	4.50	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	4.67	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	100/ 948	4.58	4.01	3.95	3.75	4.83	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	23/ 221	4.40	4.32	4.16	4.05	4.80	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	49/ 243	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.08	4.67	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	50/ 212	4.57	4.28	4.40	4.43	4.80	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	45/ 209	4.73	4.49	4.35	4.38	4.80	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	3	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 555	4.67	4.33	4.29	4.14	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 88	4.67	4.37	4.54	4.31	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	4.00	4.25	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	4.67	4.72	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	66/ 92	3.67	4.21	4.35	4.01	4.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	4.33	4.61	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 52	4.75	4.25	4.06	3.72	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	25/ 48	4.00	3.88	4.09	3.65	4.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	28/ 39	4.17	4.11	4.47	4.36	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	4.33	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.00	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	35/ 53	4.17	4.33	4.30	4.17	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	28/ 30	4.08	4.29	4.16	4.06	3.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	30/ 41	4.17	4.46	4.43	4.27	4.00	

Course-Section: ELC 041 8011
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: VALAIS, TERESA
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 662
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
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	7
84-150	1	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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 043 8010
 Title ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI
 Instructor: MUNDY, SUSAN E
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 663
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	0	0	1	2	3.20	1572/1649	3.20	4.26	4.28	4.11	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	966/1648	4.20	4.49	4.23	4.16	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1087/1375	3.80	4.06	4.27	4.10	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	1260/1595	3.80	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1249/1533	3.50	4.18	4.04	3.87	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	755/1512	4.20	4.40	4.10	3.86	4.20	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	833/1646	4.80	4.78	4.69	4.67	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.32	4.06	3.96	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.74	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.75	4.70	4.64	4.50	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1127/1564	4.00	4.59	4.28	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.69	4.29	4.20	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	457/1352	4.33	4.29	3.98	3.86	4.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.08	3.86	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.03	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.01	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	917/ 948	2.50	4.01	3.95	3.75	2.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 0	Required for Majors 0	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 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 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 664
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	4	4.43	749/1649	4.43	4.26	4.28	4.11	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	300/1648	4.71	4.49	4.23	4.16	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	888/1375	4.14	4.06	4.27	4.10	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	956/1595	4.14	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	718/1533	4.14	4.18	4.04	3.87	4.14	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	493/1512	4.43	4.40	4.10	3.86	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	720/1623	4.33	4.20	4.16	4.08	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.78	4.69	4.67	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.32	4.06	3.96	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	316/1568	4.86	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	765/1572	4.83	4.75	4.70	4.64	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	216/1564	4.86	4.59	4.28	4.20	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	448/1559	4.71	4.69	4.29	4.20	4.71	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	4.20	4.29	3.98	3.86	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	726/1384	4.17	4.58	4.08	3.86	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	891/1368	4.17	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	431/ 948	4.00	4.01	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	64/ 221	4.50	4.32	4.16	4.05	4.50	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	155/ 243	4.00	4.38	4.12	4.08	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	156/ 212	4.00	4.28	4.40	4.43	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	109/ 209	4.50	4.49	4.35	4.38	4.50	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	55/ 88	4.50	4.37	4.54	4.31	4.50	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	46/ 85	4.50	4.25	4.47	4.30	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	41/ 81	4.50	4.72	4.43	4.39	4.50	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	42/ 92	4.50	4.21	4.35	4.01	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	37/ 288	4.50	4.61	3.68	3.54	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	42/ 52	3.00	4.25	4.06	3.72	3.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	41/ 48	3.00	3.88	4.09	3.65	3.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	4.00	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 53	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.17	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	9/ 30	4.50	4.29	4.16	4.06	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 41	4.50	4.46	4.43	4.27	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 24	4.50	4.75	4.42	4.24	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	40/ 110	4.00	4.50	3.99	3.83	4.00	

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 664
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 052 8011
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: MUNDY, SUSAN E
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 665
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	9	5	4.36	844/1649	4.36	4.26	4.28	4.11	4.36	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	672/1648	4.43	4.49	4.23	4.16	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	6	4.36	714/1375	4.36	4.06	4.27	4.10	4.36	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	782/1595	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	8	5	4.21	663/1533	4.21	4.18	4.04	3.87	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	7	5	4.21	735/1512	4.21	4.40	4.10	3.86	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	608/1623	4.43	4.20	4.16	4.08	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	865/1646	4.79	4.78	4.69	4.67	4.79	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	914/1621	4.00	4.32	4.06	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	683/1568	4.64	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	1146/1572	4.60	4.75	4.70	4.64	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	887/1564	4.30	4.59	4.28	4.20	4.30	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	777/1559	4.44	4.69	4.29	4.20	4.44	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	360/1352	4.44	4.29	3.98	3.86	4.44	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	499/1384	4.44	4.58	4.08	3.86	4.44	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	860/1368	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.22	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	542/ 948	3.89	4.01	3.95	3.75	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 221	****	4.32	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.38	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 212	****	4.28	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 209	****	4.49	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 555	****	4.33	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 88	****	4.37	4.54	4.31	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 85	****	4.25	4.47	4.30	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 81	****	4.72	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 92	****	4.21	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 288	****	4.61	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	4.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	3.88	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 39	****	4.11	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 312	****	4.00	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	4.33	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.29	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 41	****	4.46	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 24	****	4.75	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/ 110	****	4.50	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ELC 052 8011
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: MUNDY, SUSAN E
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 665
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	4	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	14	Non-major	14
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	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				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: EDMONDS, LORI M
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 666
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	3	1	3.50	1498/1649	4.00	4.26	4.28	4.11	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	1408/1648	4.08	4.49	4.23	4.16	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	3.40	1243/1375	3.70	4.06	4.27	4.10	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	1	1	3.33	1470/1595	3.92	4.25	4.20	4.03	3.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	3.33	1338/1533	3.67	4.18	4.04	3.87	3.33	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1170/1512	4.08	4.40	4.10	3.86	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	915/1623	4.33	4.20	4.16	4.08	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1462/1646	4.58	4.78	4.69	4.67	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1151/1621	4.15	4.32	4.06	3.96	3.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1373/1568	4.42	4.74	4.43	4.39	3.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	1365/1572	4.67	4.75	4.70	4.64	4.33	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1336/1564	4.33	4.59	4.28	4.20	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1031/1559	4.58	4.69	4.29	4.20	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	690/1352	4.25	4.29	3.98	3.86	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	437/1384	4.25	4.58	4.08	3.86	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	796/1368	4.42	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	4.00	431/ 948	4.25	4.01	3.95	3.75	4.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 221	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.05	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	4.00	4.28	4.40	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 209	4.00	4.49	4.35	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.14	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	74/ 88	4.00	4.37	4.54	4.31	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	46/ 85	4.25	4.25	4.47	4.30	4.50	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 81	5.00	4.72	4.43	4.39	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	5.00	4.21	4.35	4.01	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 288	5.00	4.61	3.68	3.54	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	4.50	4.25	4.06	3.72	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	4.50	3.88	4.09	3.65	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	4.00	4.11	4.47	4.36	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.37	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 312	4.00	4.00	3.68	3.51	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.17	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	4.50	4.29	4.16	4.06	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 41	5.00	4.46	4.43	4.27	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	5.00	4.75	4.42	4.24	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 110	5.00	4.50	3.99	3.83	****	

Course-Section: ELC 053 8010
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: EDMONDS, LORI M
 Enrollment: 7
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 666
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	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	6	Non-major	6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 053 8011
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: EDMONDS, LORI M
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 667
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	4.50	644/1649	4.00	4.26	4.28	4.11	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	556/1648	4.08	4.49	4.23	4.16	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	950/1375	3.70	4.06	4.27	4.10	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	497/1595	3.92	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	815/1533	3.67	4.18	4.04	3.87	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	380/1512	4.08	4.40	4.10	3.86	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	502/1623	4.33	4.20	4.16	4.08	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1646	4.58	4.78	4.69	4.67	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	374/1621	4.15	4.32	4.06	3.96	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1568	4.42	4.74	4.43	4.39	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1572	4.67	4.75	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1564	4.33	4.59	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1559	4.58	4.69	4.29	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	303/1352	4.25	4.29	3.98	3.86	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	795/1384	4.25	4.58	4.08	3.86	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1382	4.50	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	654/1368	4.42	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	203/ 948	4.25	4.01	3.95	3.75	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	129/ 221	4.00	4.32	4.16	4.05	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	65/ 243	4.50	4.38	4.12	4.08	4.50	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	156/ 212	4.00	4.28	4.40	4.43	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	151/ 209	4.00	4.49	4.35	4.38	4.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	388/ 555	4.00	4.33	4.29	4.14	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	74/ 88	4.00	4.37	4.54	4.31	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	67/ 85	4.25	4.25	4.47	4.30	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 81	5.00	4.72	4.43	4.39	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 92	5.00	4.21	4.35	4.01	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 288	5.00	4.61	3.68	3.54	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	29/ 52	4.50	4.25	4.06	3.72	4.50	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	16/ 48	4.50	3.88	4.09	3.65	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 39	4.00	4.11	4.47	4.36	4.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.67	4.38	4.37	5.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	68/ 312	4.00	4.00	3.68	3.51	4.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	25/ 53	4.50	4.33	4.30	4.17	4.50	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	9/ 30	4.50	4.29	4.16	4.06	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 41	5.00	4.46	4.43	4.27	5.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 24	5.00	4.75	4.42	4.24	5.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 110	5.00	4.50	3.99	3.83	5.00	

Course-Section: ELC 053 8011
 Title ESL:ADV SPEAK & LISTEN
 Instructor: EDMONDS, LORI M
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 667
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	2	Required for Majors	2	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	2	Non-major	2
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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 054 8010
 Title ESL:X-CULTURAL COMMUNC
 Instructor: LINVILLE, HEATH
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 668
 FEB 11, 2009
 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	1	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.26	4.28	4.11	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.49	4.23	4.16	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.25	4.20	4.03	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.18	4.04	3.87	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.40	4.10	3.86	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.78	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1621	5.00	4.32	4.06	3.96	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1568	5.00	4.74	4.43	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.75	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.59	4.28	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1559	5.00	4.69	4.29	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1352	5.00	4.29	3.98	3.86	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.58	4.08	3.86	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1382	5.00	4.44	4.29	4.03	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1368	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.01	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 948	5.00	4.01	3.95	3.75	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 061 8050
 Title ESL TOP I:WRIT FR RESR
 Instructor: FOLLETT, SONJA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Fall 2008

Page 669
 FEB 11, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.26	4.28	4.11	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.49	4.23	4.16	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.06	4.27	4.10	4.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	236/1595	4.75	4.25	4.20	4.03	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	180/1533	4.75	4.18	4.04	3.87	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1512	5.00	4.40	4.10	3.86	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.20	4.16	4.08	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	913/1646	4.75	4.78	4.69	4.67	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	687/1621	4.25	4.32	4.06	3.96	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	480/1568	4.75	4.74	4.43	4.39	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.75	4.70	4.64	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1564	5.00	4.59	4.28	4.20	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.69	4.29	4.20	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1219/1352	3.00	4.29	3.98	3.86	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.58	4.08	3.86	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.44	4.29	4.03	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	948/1368	4.00	4.51	4.30	4.01	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	844/ 948	3.00	4.01	3.95	3.75	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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