

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010  
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR  
 Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 595  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1504	****	4.24	4.27	4.13	****
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1503	****	4.22	4.20	4.16	****
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1290	****	4.32	4.28	4.19	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1453	****	4.22	4.21	4.11	****
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	****/1421	****	4.08	4.00	3.91	****
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/1365	****	4.11	4.08	3.96	****
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/1485	****	4.20	4.16	4.13	****
8. How many times was class cancelled	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1504	****	4.68	4.69	4.66	****
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1483	****	4.07	4.06	3.97	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1425	****	4.41	4.41	4.36	****
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1426	****	4.72	4.69	4.56	****
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1418	****	4.29	4.25	4.20	****
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1416	****	4.34	4.26	4.21	****
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.82	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1312	****	4.12	4.00	3.69	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1303	****	4.39	4.24	3.93	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1299	****	4.34	4.25	3.94	****
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	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	13	Non-major	11
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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: ELC 043 8010  
 Title ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI  
 Instructor: Valais, Teresa  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 596  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.13	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	3.91	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.11	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1483	5.00	4.07	4.06	3.97	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.21	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	3.82	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	3.80	5.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.07	4.09	3.90	5.00
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 244	5.00	4.12	4.09	4.07	5.00
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 227	5.00	4.49	4.40	4.24	5.00
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 225	5.00	4.40	4.23	4.01	5.00
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 207	5.00	4.22	4.09	4.01	5.00
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.60	4.61	4.64	5.00
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 70	5.00	4.54	4.35	4.43	5.00
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 67	5.00	4.32	4.34	3.88	5.00
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 76	5.00	4.41	4.44	4.51	5.00
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.17	4.17	3.83	5.00
Field Work														
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 56	5.00	4.12	4.23	4.11	5.00
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 44	5.00	4.68	4.65	4.60	5.00
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	28/ 47	4.00	4.32	4.29	4.00	4.00
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 39	5.00	4.61	4.44	5.00	5.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	30/ 40	4.00	4.28	4.53	4.52	4.00
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 35	5.00	4.43	4.49	4.65	5.00

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	36	5.00	4.38	4.60	4.48	5.00
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	20	5.00	5.00	4.24	4.92	5.00
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/	16	5.00	5.00	4.51	5.00	5.00

Course-Section: ELC 043 8010  
 Title ESL:SPEAKING & LISTENI  
 Instructor: Valais, Teresa  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 596  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	0
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				
				?	1						



Course-Section: ELC 051 8011  
 Title ESL:ADV WRITNG & GRAMMA  
 Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 598  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	889/1504	4.38	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1052/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1155/1290	3.92	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	440/1453	4.17	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	548/1421	4.29	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	0	3	4.00	782/1365	4.17	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.50	1284/1485	3.75	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	3.97	****
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	420/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	825/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	848/1418	4.13	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	871/1416	4.29	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	129/1199	4.50	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	356/1303	4.29	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	798/1299	4.38	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	508/ 758	3.88	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	6	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	6	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: ELC 051 8011  
 Title ESL:ADV WRING & GRAMMA  
 Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 598  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	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	1	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	4				
				?	0						



Course-Section: ELC 052 8010  
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA  
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T  
 Enrollment: 7  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 599  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1010/1504	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	816/1503	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	866/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	1136/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	479/1421	4.47	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	690/1365	4.37	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	3.71	1200/1485	4.06	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	850/1483	4.30	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	876/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1183/1426	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	818/1418	4.54	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	961/1416	4.47	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	2	0	2	1	0	2.40	1153/1199	3.60	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	572/1312	4.34	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	3.71	1059/1303	3.96	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	395/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.71
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	343/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	7	Non-major	3
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 052 8011  
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA  
 Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE  
 Enrollment: 9  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 600  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	4	0	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	962/1504	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	1052/1503	4.14	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	937/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1168/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	247/1421	4.47	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	223/1365	4.37	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	4	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	591/1485	4.06	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	258/1483	4.30	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1426	4.71	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	191/1418	4.54	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	255/1416	4.47	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	105/1199	3.60	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	465/1312	4.34	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	833/1303	3.96	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	834/1299	4.46	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	328/ 758	4.18	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.20
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	4	A	0	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	2	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 071 8010  
 Title ADV ACADEMIC DISCOURSE  
 Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 601  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	1	1	3.33	1403/1504	3.33	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1017/1421	3.67	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	378/1418	4.67	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	806/1416	4.33	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	2	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	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 073 8010  
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION  
 Instructor: BRESEE, SUSAN  
 Enrollment: 3  
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2005

Page 602  
 JUN 14, 2005  
 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	0	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1305/1421	3.00	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1296/1365	3.00	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1284/1485	3.50	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.36	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.20	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	623/1416	4.50	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	3.82	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	3.69	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	3.93	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	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	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						