

Course-Section: ELC 401 1  
 Title ELC41  
 Instructor: Draganescu, Mari  
 Enrollment: 36  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 570  
 MAR 22, 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	1	5	4	4.09	1051/1509	3.61	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1355/1509	3.90	3.87	4.26	4.26	3.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	5	2	3.45	1178/1287	3.79	3.85	4.30	4.38	3.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	2	3	3.27	1384/1459	3.70	3.91	4.22	4.32	3.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	1	5	3.91	934/1406	3.83	3.84	4.09	4.11	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	4	4	2	3.64	1126/1384	3.82	3.76	4.11	4.23	3.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	2	1	5	3.64	1249/1489	3.57	3.87	4.17	4.18	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	1070/1506	4.63	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1284/1463	3.91	4.06	4.09	4.18	3.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1094/1438	4.36	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1392/1421	4.23	4.60	4.73	4.76	3.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	1	1	5	3.60	1256/1411	4.11	4.32	4.31	4.35	3.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	1	3	3	3.67	1220/1405	3.98	4.14	4.32	4.34	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	3	2	1	2	3	3.00	1131/1236	3.17	3.87	4.00	4.03	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	1	4	2	3.18	1136/1260	3.59	3.92	4.14	4.25	3.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	2	2	3	3	3.45	1140/1255	3.64	3.93	4.33	4.46	3.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1210/1258	3.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	3.18
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	691/ 873	3.86	4.24	4.03	4.26	3.55
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 198	3.67	4.12	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 184	4.50	3.48	4.48	4.66	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 401 2  
 Title ELC41  
 Instructor: Zhang,Zuotang  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 571  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	3	1	2	3.13	1467/1509	3.61	3.92	4.31	4.39	3.13
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	859/1509	3.90	3.87	4.26	4.26	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	869/1287	3.79	3.85	4.30	4.38	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	894/1459	3.70	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1045/1406	3.83	3.84	4.09	4.11	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	807/1384	3.82	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	1	3.50	1303/1489	3.57	3.87	4.17	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	845/1506	4.63	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	467/1463	3.91	4.06	4.09	4.18	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	800/1438	4.36	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	665/1421	4.23	4.60	4.73	4.76	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	469/1411	4.11	4.32	4.31	4.35	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	874/1405	3.98	4.14	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1056/1236	3.17	3.87	4.00	4.03	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	746/1260	3.59	3.92	4.14	4.25	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1023/1255	3.64	3.93	4.33	4.46	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	867/1258	3.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	383/ 873	3.86	4.24	4.03	4.26	4.17
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	171/ 184	3.33	3.32	4.16	4.62	3.33
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	174/ 198	3.67	4.12	4.22	4.37	3.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	105/ 184	4.50	3.48	4.48	4.66	4.50
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	65/ 177	4.67	4.01	4.36	4.47	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	103/ 165	4.00	3.69	4.18	4.29	4.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	67/ 89	4.00	3.67	4.49	4.71	4.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.27	4.54	4.83	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	61/ 90	4.33	4.24	4.50	4.69	4.33
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 92	4.67	3.79	4.38	4.64	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	44/ 93	4.33	3.31	4.06	4.32	4.33
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	26/ 48	4.33	4.33	4.39	4.75	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	34/ 48	4.00	4.05	4.41	4.54	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	34/ 47	4.33	4.09	4.51	4.51	4.33
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	40/ 47	3.00	3.17	4.18	4.19	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	38/ 44	3.67	4.18	4.32	4.07	3.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	28/ 49	4.00	3.74	4.26	4.67	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	18/ 41	4.00	3.95	4.14	4.50	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	31/ 46	4.00	3.60	4.31	4.67	4.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	21/ 37	4.33	2.95	4.05	4.67	4.33
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	15/ 30	4.33	3.93	4.27	4.33	4.33

Course-Section: ELC 401 2  
 Title ELC41  
 Instructor: Zhang, Zuotang  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 571  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	4	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 403 1  
 Title ELC43  
 Instructor: Mundy, Susan E.  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 572  
 MAR 22, 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	3	0	0	1	3	2	0	3.17	1461/1509	4.14	3.92	4.31	4.39	3.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	2	3	1	0	2.83	1489/1509	4.03	3.87	4.26	4.26	2.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	2	1	1	1	2.83	1276/1287	3.86	3.85	4.30	4.38	2.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	0	1	3	0	2.83	1447/1459	4.03	3.91	4.22	4.32	2.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	0	0	2.67	1381/1406	3.81	3.84	4.09	4.11	2.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	3	2	0	3.00	1322/1384	3.75	3.76	4.11	4.23	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1303/1489	4.17	3.87	4.17	4.18	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	1070/1506	4.67	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/1463	4.80	4.06	4.09	4.18	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1203/1438	4.44	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1376/1421	4.56	4.60	4.73	4.76	3.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1187/1411	4.56	4.32	4.31	4.35	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	1	2	0	3.00	1348/1405	4.17	4.14	4.32	4.34	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1207/1236	3.58	3.87	4.00	4.03	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1133/1260	4.32	3.92	4.14	4.25	3.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	1187/1255	4.23	3.93	4.33	4.46	3.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	932/1258	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	2	1	1	3.20	780/ 873	4.32	4.24	4.03	4.26	3.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 184	****	3.32	4.16	4.62	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	7	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	4.12	4.22	4.37	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 184	****	3.48	4.48	4.66	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 177	****	4.01	4.36	4.47	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 165	****	3.69	4.18	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 89	****	3.67	4.49	4.71	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	4.27	4.54	4.83	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 90	****	4.24	4.50	4.69	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	****	3.79	4.38	4.64	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 93	****	3.31	4.06	4.32	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/ 48	****	4.33	4.39	4.75	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 48	****	4.05	4.41	4.54	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	4.09	4.51	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 47	****	3.17	4.18	4.19	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.18	4.32	4.07	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 49	****	3.74	4.26	4.67	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	3.95	4.14	4.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	****	3.60	4.31	4.67	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	2.95	4.05	4.67	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 30	****	3.93	4.27	4.33	****

Course-Section: ELC 403 1  
 Title ELC43  
 Instructor: Mundy, Susan E.  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 572  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	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	1	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
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 403 2  
 Title ELC43  
 Instructor: Follett, Sonja (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 573  
 MAR 22, 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	3	5	4.63	458/1509	4.14	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1509	4.03	3.87	4.26	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	668/1287	3.86	3.85	4.30	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1459	4.03	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	470/1406	3.81	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	734/1384	3.75	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	458/1489	4.17	3.87	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	845/1506	4.67	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	118/1463	4.80	4.06	4.09	4.18	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	262/1438	4.44	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	614/1421	4.56	4.60	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	169/1411	4.56	4.32	4.31	4.35	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	634/1405	4.17	4.14	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	126/1236	3.58	3.87	4.00	4.03	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	157/1260	4.32	3.92	4.14	4.25	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	344/1255	4.23	3.93	4.33	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	79/ 873	4.32	4.24	4.03	4.26	4.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 4	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 1	Under-grad 8	Non-major 8
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 403 2  
 Title ELC43  
 Instructor:  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 574  
 MAR 22, 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	3	5	4.63	458/1509	4.14	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	401/1509	4.03	3.87	4.26	4.26	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	668/1287	3.86	3.85	4.30	4.38	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	324/1459	4.03	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	470/1406	3.81	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	734/1384	3.75	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	458/1489	4.17	3.87	4.17	4.18	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	845/1506	4.67	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1438	4.44	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1421	4.56	4.60	4.73	4.76	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1411	4.56	4.32	4.31	4.35	4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1405	4.17	4.14	4.32	4.34	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1236	3.58	3.87	4.00	4.03	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	157/1260	4.32	3.92	4.14	4.25	4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	344/1255	4.23	3.93	4.33	4.46	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1258	4.67	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	79/ 873	4.32	4.24	4.03	4.26	4.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors		4	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		1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
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 43 1  
 Title ESL: Speaking and List  
 Instructor: Mundy, Susan E.  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 575  
 MAR 22, 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	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	800/1509	4.04	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	774/1509	4.17	3.87	4.26	4.26	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	924/1287	4.25	3.85	4.30	4.38	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	686/1459	4.29	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	813/1406	3.88	3.84	4.09	4.11	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	807/1384	4.13	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	986/1489	4.13	3.87	4.17	4.18	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	4.88	4.78	4.67	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	853/1463	3.67	4.06	4.09	4.18	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.50	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1014/1421	4.83	4.60	4.73	4.76	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	416/1411	4.83	4.32	4.31	4.35	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	459/1405	4.58	4.14	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	176/1236	4.71	3.87	4.00	4.03	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	558/1260	4.33	3.92	4.14	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	723/1255	4.67	3.93	4.33	4.46	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	932/1258	4.50	4.34	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	292/ 873	4.67	4.24	4.03	4.26	4.33

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		
-----												
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors		1	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		2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
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 43 2  
 Title ESL: Speaking and List  
 Instructor: Follett, Sonja  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 576  
 MAR 22, 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	1	0	2	3.75	1304/1509	4.04	3.92	4.31	4.39	3.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1086/1509	4.17	3.87	4.26	4.26	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	519/1287	4.25	3.85	4.30	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	770/1459	4.29	3.91	4.22	4.32	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	3.75	1045/1406	3.88	3.84	4.09	4.11	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	619/1384	4.13	3.76	4.11	4.23	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	760/1489	4.13	3.87	4.17	4.18	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	845/1506	4.88	4.78	4.67	4.67	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1314/1463	3.67	4.06	4.09	4.18	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1438	4.83	4.58	4.46	4.50	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	4.83	4.60	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1411	4.83	4.32	4.31	4.35	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	634/1405	4.58	4.14	4.32	4.34	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	126/1236	4.71	3.87	4.00	4.03	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	558/1260	4.33	3.92	4.14	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1255	4.67	3.93	4.33	4.46	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1258	4.50	4.34	4.38	4.51	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/ 873	4.67	4.24	4.03	4.26	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	1	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	4	Non-major	4
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 501 1  
 Title ELC51  
 Instructor: Follett, Sonja  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 577  
 MAR 22, 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	1	3	4.75	303/1509	3.08	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	256/1509	3.08	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	261/1287	3.35	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	191/1459	3.35	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	164/1406	3.35	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	149/1384	2.95	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	458/1489	2.90	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	1070/1506	4.90	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	545/1463	3.28	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	447/1438	4.21	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	881/1421	4.38	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	617/1411	3.33	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	345/1405	3.08	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	489/1236	3.25	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	244/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	344/1255	3.35	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258	3.88	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	114/ 873	3.88	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	37/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	83/ 198	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.33
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	77/ 184	2.53	3.48	4.48	4.11	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	110/ 177	3.27	4.01	4.36	4.41	4.33
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 165	3.33	3.69	4.18	4.25	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	51/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.13	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.13	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 92	3.33	3.79	4.38	4.30	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 93	2.53	3.31	4.06	4.04	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 48	4.07	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.33
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	30/ 48	4.07	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.33
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	26/ 47	4.13	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47	2.53	3.17	4.18	4.03	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	26/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.33
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	25/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.33
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	13/ 41	4.07	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.33
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	27/ 46	3.27	3.60	4.31	4.11	4.33
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	21/ 37	1.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	4.33
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	15/ 30	3.27	3.93	4.27	4.26	4.33

Course-Section: ELC 501 1  
 Title ELC51  
 Instructor: Follett, Sonja  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 577  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	4	Non-major	4
84-150	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 501 2  
 Title ELC51  
 Instructor: Mundy,Susan E. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 578  
 MAR 22, 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	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1495/1509	3.08	3.92	4.31	4.39	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1496/1509	3.08	3.87	4.26	4.25	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.35	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.35	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.35	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1370/1384	2.95	3.76	4.11	4.16	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1463/1489	2.90	3.87	4.17	4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.90	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	325/1463	3.28	4.06	4.09	4.15	2.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1343/1438	4.21	4.58	4.46	4.49	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1345/1421	4.38	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	617/1411	3.33	4.32	4.31	4.33	2.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1265/1405	3.08	4.14	4.32	4.33	2.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	984/1236	3.25	3.87	4.00	3.98	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1226/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1202/1255	3.35	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.88	4.34	4.38	4.50	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	650/ 873	3.88	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.48	4.48	4.11	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	169/ 177	3.27	4.01	4.36	4.41	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165	3.33	3.69	4.18	4.25	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.13	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90	4.13	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92	3.33	3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	90/ 93	2.53	3.31	4.06	4.04	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47	4.13	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	44/ 47	2.53	3.17	4.18	4.03	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	46/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 41	4.07	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 46	3.27	3.60	4.31	4.11	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	34/ 37	1.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	1.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 30	3.27	3.93	4.27	4.26	3.00

Course-Section: ELC 501 2  
 Title ELC51  
 Instructor: Mundy, Susan E. (Instr. A)  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 578  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	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	3	Non-major	3
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 501 2  
 Title ELC51  
 Instructor:  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 579  
 MAR 22, 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	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1495/1509	3.08	3.92	4.31	4.39	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1496/1509	3.08	3.87	4.26	4.25	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.35	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.35	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.35	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1370/1384	2.95	3.76	4.11	4.16	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1463/1489	2.90	3.87	4.17	4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.90	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
Lecture														
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1405/1405	3.08	4.14	4.32	4.33	2.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	1219/1236	3.25	3.87	4.00	3.98	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1226/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1202/1255	3.35	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.88	4.34	4.38	4.50	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	650/ 873	3.88	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.48	4.48	4.11	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	169/ 177	3.27	4.01	4.36	4.41	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165	3.33	3.69	4.18	4.25	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.13	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90	4.13	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92	3.33	3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	90/ 93	2.53	3.31	4.06	4.04	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47	4.13	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	44/ 47	2.53	3.17	4.18	4.03	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	46/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 41	4.07	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 46	3.27	3.60	4.31	4.11	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	34/ 37	1.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	1.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 30	3.27	3.93	4.27	4.26	3.00

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	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	3	Non-major	3
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 501 2  
 Title ELC51  
 Instructor:  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 580  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies		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	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1495/1509	3.08	3.92	4.31	4.39	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1496/1509	3.08	3.87	4.26	4.25	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.35	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.35	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.35	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1370/1384	2.95	3.76	4.11	4.16	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1463/1489	2.90	3.87	4.17	4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.90	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
Lecture														
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1411/1411	3.33	4.32	4.31	4.33	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1226/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1202/1255	3.35	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.88	4.34	4.38	4.50	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	650/ 873	3.88	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.48	4.48	4.11	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	169/ 177	3.27	4.01	4.36	4.41	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165	3.33	3.69	4.18	4.25	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.13	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90	4.13	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92	3.33	3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	90/ 93	2.53	3.31	4.06	4.04	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47	4.13	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	44/ 47	2.53	3.17	4.18	4.03	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	46/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 41	4.07	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 46	3.27	3.60	4.31	4.11	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	34/ 37	1.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	1.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 30	3.27	3.93	4.27	4.26	3.00



Course-Section: ELC 501 2  
 Title ELC51  
 Instructor:  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 3

(Instr. C)

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 580  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	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	3	Non-major	3
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 501 2  
 Title ELC51  
 Instructor:  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 581  
 MAR 22, 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	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1495/1509	3.08	3.92	4.31	4.39	2.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1496/1509	3.08	3.87	4.26	4.25	2.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.35	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.35	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.35	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1370/1384	2.95	3.76	4.11	4.16	2.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	1463/1489	2.90	3.87	4.17	4.14	2.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1506	4.90	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1462/1463	3.28	4.06	4.09	4.15	2.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	1226/1260	3.08	3.92	4.14	4.21	2.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1202/1255	3.35	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	1102/1258	3.88	4.34	4.38	4.50	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	650/ 873	3.88	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.32	4.16	4.07	2.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.07	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	181/ 184	2.53	3.48	4.48	4.11	2.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	169/ 177	3.27	4.01	4.36	4.41	3.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165	3.33	3.69	4.18	4.25	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.33	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.13	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90	4.13	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92	3.33	3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	90/ 93	2.53	3.31	4.06	4.04	2.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	34/ 48	4.07	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	39/ 47	4.13	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	44/ 47	2.53	3.17	4.18	4.03	2.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.07	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	46/ 49	3.27	3.74	4.26	4.16	3.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	18/ 41	4.07	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 46	3.27	3.60	4.31	4.11	3.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	34/ 37	1.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	1.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	26/ 30	3.27	3.93	4.27	4.26	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	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	3	Non-major	3
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			

P	0			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	0	
?	0			

Course-Section: ELC 503 1  
 Title ELC53  
 Instructor: Edmonds,Lori M  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 582  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR NA		Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	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	2	8	4.33	800/1509	4.33	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	543/1509	4.50	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	472/1287	4.56	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	686/1459	4.33	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	2	6	4.08	753/1406	4.08	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.08
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	3	5	3.75	1050/1384	3.75	3.76	4.11	4.16	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	4	7	4.33	674/1489	4.33	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	545/1463	4.33	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	631/1438	4.64	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1099/1421	4.58	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.58
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	677/1411	4.45	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	7	4.42	745/1405	4.42	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	4	6	4.36	392/1236	4.36	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.36
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	558/1260	4.33	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	828/1255	4.18	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.18
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	710/1258	4.42	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.42
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	333/ 873	4.25	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.25
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	37/ 184	4.67	3.32	4.16	4.07	4.67
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 198	4.67	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.67
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	77/ 184	4.67	3.48	4.48	4.11	4.67
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	65/ 177	4.67	4.01	4.36	4.41	4.67
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	39/ 165	4.67	3.69	4.18	4.25	4.67
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	51/ 89	4.67	3.67	4.49	4.39	4.67
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	48/ 92	4.67	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.67
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	41/ 90	4.67	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.67
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	36/ 92	4.67	3.79	4.38	4.30	4.67
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	24/ 93	4.67	3.31	4.06	4.04	4.67
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/ 48	4.67	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.67
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 48	4.67	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.67
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	26/ 47	4.67	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.67
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	20/ 47	4.67	3.17	4.18	4.03	4.67
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 44	4.67	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.67
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	16/ 49	4.67	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.67
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	10/ 41	4.67	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.67
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	22/ 46	4.67	3.60	4.31	4.11	4.67
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	17/ 37	4.67	2.95	4.05	3.69	4.67
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	13/ 30	4.67	3.93	4.27	4.26	4.67

Course-Section: ELC 503 1  
 Title ELC53  
 Instructor: Edmonds,Lori M  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 582  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	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	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 504 1  
 Title ELC54  
 Instructor: Vinogradova,Pol  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 583  
 MAR 22, 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	2	6	3	4.09	1051/1509	4.27	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	742/1509	4.47	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	2	3	1	3.57	1144/1287	3.79	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	843/1459	4.36	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	934/1406	4.08	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	807/1384	4.08	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	833/1489	4.22	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	965/1506	4.65	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	1	4.00	853/1463	4.50	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	970/1438	4.56	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1189/1421	4.64	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	779/1411	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	798/1405	4.52	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	7	2	3.82	819/1236	4.06	3.87	4.00	3.98	3.82
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	460/1260	4.35	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	877/1255	4.17	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.09
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	591/1258	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	279/ 873	4.35	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.36
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	2	0	0	1	1	6	1	3.78	145/ 184	3.78	3.32	4.16	4.07	3.78
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	1	0	2	5	1	3.56	180/ 198	3.56	4.12	4.22	4.31	3.56
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	146/ 184	4.22	3.48	4.48	4.11	4.22
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	91/ 177	4.44	4.01	4.36	4.41	4.44
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	97/ 165	4.11	3.69	4.18	4.25	4.11
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	2	1	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	75/ 89	3.88	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.88
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	69/ 92	4.22	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.22
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	63/ 90	4.22	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.22
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	66/ 92	4.11	3.79	4.38	4.30	4.11
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	63/ 93	3.89	3.31	4.06	4.04	3.89
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	32/ 48	4.22	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.22
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	42/ 48	3.78	4.05	4.41	4.40	3.78
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	23/ 47	4.75	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.75
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	35/ 47	3.89	3.17	4.18	4.03	3.89
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	1	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	23/ 44	4.38	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.38
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	39/ 49	3.89	3.74	4.26	4.16	3.89
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	1	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	35/ 41	3.75	3.95	4.14	4.08	3.75
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	1	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	28/ 46	4.25	3.60	4.31	4.11	4.25
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	1	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	20/ 37	4.38	2.95	4.05	3.69	4.38
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	1	0	0	2	4	2	4.00	16/ 30	4.00	3.93	4.27	4.26	4.00

Course-Section: ELC 504 1  
 Title ELC54  
 Instructor: Vinogradova, Pol  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 583  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	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	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
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	1				
				?	2						

Course-Section: ELC 504 2  
 Title ELC54  
 Instructor: Palmer, Tsisana  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 584  
 MAR 22, 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	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	661/1509	4.27	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	447/1509	4.47	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	924/1287	3.79	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	410/1459	4.36	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	587/1406	4.08	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	701/1384	4.08	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	760/1489	4.22	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	11	4.67	941/1506	4.65	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1463	4.50	4.06	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	447/1438	4.56	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	716/1421	4.64	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	520/1411	4.47	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.58
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	459/1405	4.52	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	451/1236	4.06	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	621/1260	4.35	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	1	3	0	8	4.25	783/1255	4.17	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	620/1258	4.52	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	292/ 873	4.35	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 184	3.78	3.32	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 198	3.56	4.12	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 184	4.22	3.48	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 177	4.44	4.01	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 165	4.11	3.69	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 89	3.88	3.67	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 92	4.22	4.27	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 90	4.22	4.24	4.50	4.48	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	4.11	3.79	4.38	4.30	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 93	3.89	3.31	4.06	4.04	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	4.22	4.33	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	3.78	4.05	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	4.75	4.09	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	3.89	3.17	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	4.38	4.18	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 49	3.89	3.74	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	3.75	3.95	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 46	4.25	3.60	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	4.38	2.95	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	4.00	3.93	4.27	4.26	****



Course-Section: ELC 504 2  
 Title ELC54  
 Instructor: Palmer, Tsisana  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 584  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	Required for Majors	2	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	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	12
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 51 1  
 Title ESL: Adv Writing and G  
 Instructor: Follett, Sonja  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 585  
 MAR 22, 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	1	7	4.88	184/1509	4.27	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	256/1509	4.46	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	261/1287	4.46	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	454/1459	4.08	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	112/1406	4.43	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	421/1384	4.13	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	224/1489	4.36	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	722/1506	4.82	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	325/1463	4.42	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	646/1438	4.71	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	1107/1421	4.49	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	169/1411	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	205/1405	4.64	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	383/1236	4.06	3.87	4.00	3.98	4.38
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	621/1260	4.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	690/1255	4.19	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	274/1258	4.81	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	274/ 873	4.52	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.38
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	28/ 184	4.75	3.32	4.16	4.07	4.75
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 198	5.00	4.12	4.22	4.31	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	53/ 184	4.75	3.48	4.48	4.11	4.75
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.01	4.36	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	52/ 165	4.50	3.69	4.18	4.25	4.50
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	59/ 89	4.50	3.67	4.49	4.39	4.50
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	58/ 92	4.50	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.50
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	54/ 90	4.50	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.50
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	25/ 92	4.75	3.79	4.38	4.30	4.75
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	33/ 93	4.50	3.31	4.06	4.04	4.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	19/ 48	4.75	4.33	4.39	4.36	4.75
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	17/ 48	4.75	4.05	4.41	4.40	4.75
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	28/ 47	4.50	4.09	4.51	4.43	4.50
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	24/ 47	4.50	3.17	4.18	4.03	4.50
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	13/ 44	4.75	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.75
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	22/ 49	4.50	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.50
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	9/ 41	4.75	3.95	4.14	4.08	4.75
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	20/ 46	4.75	3.60	4.31	4.11	4.75
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	4	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	16/ 37	4.75	2.95	4.05	3.69	4.75
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	4	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	3.93	4.27	4.26	5.00

Course-Section: ELC 51 1  
 Title ESL: Adv Writing and G  
 Instructor: Follett, Sonja  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 585  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	1	Required for Majors	2	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	1	Under-grad	8	Non-major	8
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 51 2  
 Title ESL: Adv Writing and G  
 Instructor: Mundy,Susan E.  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 586  
 MAR 22, 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	1	2	2	3.67	1340/1509	4.27	3.92	4.31	4.39	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	952/1509	4.46	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	844/1287	4.46	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1238/1459	4.08	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	813/1406	4.43	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	993/1384	4.13	3.76	4.11	4.16	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	986/1489	4.36	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	782/1506	4.82	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	545/1463	4.42	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	363/1438	4.71	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	1217/1421	4.49	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.40
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	496/1411	4.74	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	758/1405	4.64	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	3	0	3.75	853/1236	4.06	3.87	4.00	3.98	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	936/1260	4.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	904/1255	4.19	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	421/1258	4.81	4.34	4.38	4.50	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	152/ 873	4.52	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 184	4.75	3.32	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	5.00	4.12	4.22	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 184	4.75	3.48	4.48	4.11	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 177	5.00	4.01	4.36	4.41	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 165	4.50	3.69	4.18	4.25	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 89	4.50	3.67	4.49	4.39	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 92	4.50	4.27	4.54	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 90	4.50	4.24	4.50	4.48	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	4.75	4.33	4.39	4.36	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	4.75	4.05	4.41	4.40	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 47	4.50	4.09	4.51	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	4.50	3.17	4.18	4.03	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	4.75	4.18	4.32	4.45	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 49	4.50	3.74	4.26	4.16	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	4.75	3.95	4.14	4.08	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 46	4.75	3.60	4.31	4.11	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 37	4.75	2.95	4.05	3.69	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	5.00	3.93	4.27	4.26	****

Course-Section: ELC 51 2  
 Title ESL: Adv Writing and G  
 Instructor: Mundy, Susan E.  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 586  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	3	Required for Majors	2	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	1	Under-grad	7	Non-major	7
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 53 1  
 Title ESL: ADV SPEAK & LISTE  
 Instructor: Edmonds, Lori M  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 587  
 MAR 22, 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	2	1	4.33	800/1509	4.33	3.92	4.31	4.39	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1086/1509	4.00	3.87	4.26	4.25	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	924/1287	4.00	3.85	4.30	4.22	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	686/1459	4.33	3.91	4.22	4.16	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	223/1406	4.67	3.84	4.09	4.12	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	225/1384	4.67	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	276/1489	4.67	3.87	4.17	4.14	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	209/1463	4.67	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	588/1438	4.67	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.32	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	459/1405	4.67	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.87	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	575/1255	4.50	3.93	4.33	4.43	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.01	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	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	3	Non-major	3
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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 54 1  
 Title ESL: X-Cultural Commun  
 Instructor: Vinogradova,Pol  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 588  
 MAR 22, 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	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	3.92	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1463/1509	3.00	3.87	4.26	4.25	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1247/1287	3.00	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1422/1459	3.00	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1333/1406	3.00	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	807/1384	4.00	3.76	4.11	4.16	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.87	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1383/1506	4.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	853/1463	4.00	4.06	4.09	4.15	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.60	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1051/1411	4.00	4.32	4.31	4.33	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1047/1405	4.00	4.14	4.32	4.33	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1131/1236	3.00	3.87	4.00	3.98	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	746/1260	4.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	442/ 873	4.00	4.24	4.03	4.01	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	106/ 184	4.00	3.32	4.16	4.07	4.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	123/ 198	4.00	4.12	4.22	4.31	4.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	161/ 184	4.00	3.48	4.48	4.11	4.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 177	5.00	4.01	4.36	4.41	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	159/ 165	3.00	3.69	4.18	4.25	3.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	84/ 89	3.00	3.67	4.49	4.39	3.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	73/ 92	4.00	4.27	4.54	4.52	4.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	69/ 90	4.00	4.24	4.50	4.48	4.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	87/ 92	3.00	3.79	4.38	4.30	3.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	79/ 93	3.00	3.31	4.06	4.04	3.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 48	5.00	4.33	4.39	4.36	5.00
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	47/ 48	3.00	4.05	4.41	4.40	3.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	47/ 47	2.00	4.09	4.51	4.43	2.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	40/ 47	3.00	3.17	4.18	4.03	3.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 44	4.00	4.18	4.32	4.45	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 49	4.00	3.74	4.26	4.16	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	41/ 41	2.00	3.95	4.14	4.08	2.00
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	46/ 46	2.00	3.60	4.31	4.11	2.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	31/ 37	3.00	2.95	4.05	3.69	3.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	3.93	4.27	4.26	5.00

Course-Section: ELC 54 1  
 Title ESL: X-Cultural Commun  
 Instructor: Vinogradova, Pol  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 588  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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	0	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	1	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	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ELC 601 1  
 Title ELC61  
 Instructor: Mundy, Susan E.  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 589  
 MAR 22, 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	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1435/1509	3.33	3.92	4.31	4.39	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1419/1509	3.33	3.87	4.26	4.25	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1204/1287	3.33	3.85	4.30	4.22	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	1238/1459	3.67	3.91	4.22	4.16	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1258/1406	3.33	3.84	4.09	4.12	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1264/1384	3.33	3.76	4.11	4.16	3.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	1450/1489	2.67	3.87	4.17	4.14	2.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1314/1463	3.33	4.06	4.09	4.15	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	1001/1438	4.33	4.58	4.46	4.49	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	1014/1421	4.67	4.60	4.73	4.78	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1235/1411	3.67	4.32	4.31	4.33	3.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1306/1405	3.33	4.14	4.32	4.33	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	1056/1236	3.33	3.87	4.00	3.98	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1162/1260	3.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	1202/1255	3.00	3.93	4.33	4.43	3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1184/1258	3.33	4.34	4.38	4.50	3.33
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	650/ 873	3.67	4.24	4.03	4.01	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 603 1  
 Title Speaking & Listening L  
 Instructor: Follett, Sonja  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 590  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	3.92	4.31	4.39	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1509	5.00	3.87	4.26	4.25	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1287	5.00	3.85	4.30	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	3.91	4.22	4.16	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1406	5.00	3.84	4.09	4.12	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1384	5.00	3.76	4.11	4.16	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1489	5.00	3.87	4.17	4.14	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1506	5.00	4.78	4.67	4.71	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1463	5.00	4.06	4.09	4.15	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1438	5.00	4.58	4.46	4.49	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.60	4.73	4.78	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1411	5.00	4.32	4.31	4.33	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1405	5.00	4.14	4.32	4.33	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1236	5.00	3.87	4.00	3.98	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1260	5.00	3.92	4.14	4.21	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1255	5.00	3.93	4.33	4.43	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1258	5.00	4.34	4.38	4.50	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 873	5.00	4.24	4.03	4.01	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 1	Graduate 1	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 0	Non-major 1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	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 61 1  
 Title ESL TOP I: ACAD DISCOU  
 Instructor: Mundy, Susan E.  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2009

Page 591  
 MAR 22, 2010  
 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

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	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 1 Non-major 1
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		