

Course-Section: LING 190 0101
 Title: WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 49
 Questionnaires: 31

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 929
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 11 | 3.80 | 1225/1481 | 3.80 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 3.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 16 | 4.17 | 909/1481 | 4.17 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.17 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 15 | 4.17 | 810/1249 | 4.17 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 4.17 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 17 | 4.22 | 773/1424 | 4.22 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 4.22 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 17 | 4.31 | 451/1396 | 4.31 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 4.31 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 3.86 | 912/1342 | 3.86 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.86 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 4.27 | 766/1459 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.27 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 18 | 9 | 4.21 | 1245/1480 | 4.21 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 4.21 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 13 | 3 | 3.67 | 1160/1450 | 3.67 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 3.67 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 14 | 4.07 | 1131/1409 | 4.07 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.07 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 17 | 4.50 | 1107/1407 | 4.50 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 12 | 4.00 | 1002/1399 | 4.00 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.00 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 13 | 4.00 | 1017/1400 | 4.00 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 16 | 4.27 | 434/1179 | 4.27 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 4.27 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3.58 | 965/1262 | 3.58 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 3.58 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 19 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 3.75 | 1043/1259 | 3.75 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 3.75 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 19 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 4.08 | 868/1256 | 4.08 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.08 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 19 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3.67 | ****/ 788 | **** | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | **** | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 0 | A 8 | Required for Majors | 6 |
| 28-55 | 6 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 10 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 4 | C 11 | General | 1 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 4 | D 0 | | Under-grad 31 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 10 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 22 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: LING 290 0101
 Title INTRO TO APPLIED LING
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 930
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 4.63 | 439/1481 | 4.63 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 4.63 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.69 | 299/1481 | 4.69 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 4.69 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 12 | 4.69 | 310/1249 | 4.69 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.69 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 4.23 | 762/1424 | 4.23 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.23 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.50 | 297/1396 | 4.50 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 4.50 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 4.46 | 343/1342 | 4.46 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 4.46 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 4.13 | 890/1459 | 4.13 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.13 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4 | 4.13 | 1302/1480 | 4.13 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 4.13 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 4.64 | 238/1450 | 4.64 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.64 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 319/1409 | 4.81 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.81 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 568/1407 | 4.88 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.88 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4.75 | 267/1399 | 4.75 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 4.88 | 177/1400 | 4.88 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.88 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 4.13 | 533/1179 | 4.13 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 4.13 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 190/1262 | 4.78 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.78 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 229/1259 | 4.89 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.89 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1256 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4.00 | 394/ 788 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.00 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 11 | Required for Majors | 2 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 0 | | Graduate 0 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 4 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | Under-grad 16 |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 5 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

Course-Section: LING 320 0101
 Title SYNTAX
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 931
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1481 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1481 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | 1/1249 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 157/1424 | 4.86 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.27 | 4.86 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 156/1396 | 4.71 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.00 | 4.71 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1342 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.12 | 5.00 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.29 | 749/1459 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.29 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4.29 | 1193/1480 | 4.29 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.65 | 4.29 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 127/1450 | 4.83 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.10 | 4.83 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1409 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.43 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 376/1399 | 4.67 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.67 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1400 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 5.00 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 259/1179 | 4.50 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.02 | 4.50 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5.00 | 1/1262 | 5.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.14 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4.50 | 588/1259 | 4.50 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.50 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4.75 | 357/1256 | 4.75 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | 604/ 788 | 3.50 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.50 | |

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: LING 410 0101
 Title LANGUAGE PLANNING
 Instructor: CRANDALL, JOANN
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 932
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 173/1481 | 4.89 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.45 | 4.89 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4.56 | 458/1481 | 4.56 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.56 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 154/1249 | 4.89 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 4.89 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 201/1424 | 4.78 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.78 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 126/1396 | 4.78 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.09 | 4.78 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 4.78 | 125/1342 | 4.78 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.21 | 4.78 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 113/1459 | 4.89 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.89 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.44 | 1086/1480 | 4.44 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.74 | 4.44 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 741/1450 | 4.14 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.14 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 383/1409 | 4.78 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.51 | 4.78 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4.89 | 545/1407 | 4.89 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.79 | 4.89 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 267/1399 | 4.75 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.36 | 4.75 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 4.78 | 287/1400 | 4.78 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.78 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2.88 | 1090/1179 | 2.88 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.07 | 2.88 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1262 | 5.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.33 | 5.00 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1259 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.57 | 5.00 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5.00 | 1/1256 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.60 | 5.00 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 4 | 4.14 | 347/ 788 | 4.14 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.14 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|----------------------------|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | A 6 | Required for Majors | 1 Graduate 0 Major 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | B 1 | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | C 0 | General | 1 Under-grad 9 Non-major 0 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | D 0 | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | F 0 | Electives | 0 |
| | | | P 0 | | |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 6 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LING 694 0101
 Title THE GRAMMAR OF AMERICA
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2006

Page 933
 JUN 13, 2006
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Questions | Frequencies | | | | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|----|------|------------|------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| ----- | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.80 | 233/1481 | 4.80 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.80 | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 19 | 4.90 | 115/1481 | 4.90 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.11 | 4.90 | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 4.74 | 261/1249 | 4.74 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.24 | 4.74 | |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 4.58 | 364/1424 | 4.58 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 4.58 | |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 10 | 4.71 | 156/1396 | 4.71 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.00 | 4.71 | |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4.80 | 112/1342 | 4.80 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.18 | 4.80 | |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 4.75 | 196/1459 | 4.75 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.01 | 4.75 | |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 19 | 4.95 | 421/1480 | 4.95 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.74 | 4.95 | |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.47 | 389/1450 | 4.47 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.96 | 4.47 | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 18 | 4.85 | 261/1409 | 4.85 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.85 | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 17 | 4.80 | 728/1407 | 4.80 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 4.80 | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 4.80 | 212/1399 | 4.80 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.80 | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 4.79 | 274/1400 | 4.79 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.17 | 4.79 | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 11 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3.56 | 877/1179 | 3.56 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.81 | 3.56 | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 4.35 | 487/1262 | 4.35 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.07 | 4.35 | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 4.45 | 643/1259 | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.45 | |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 4.21 | 797/1256 | 4.21 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.21 | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 4.37 | 238/ 788 | 4.37 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.97 | 4.37 | |

Frequency Distribution

| Credits Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | Reasons | Type | Majors |
|----------------|----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 5 | A 17 | Required for Majors | 1 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 0 | B 0 | | Graduate 15 |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 0 | C 0 | General | 5 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 0 | D 0 | | Under-grad 5 |
| Grad. | 15 | 3.50-4.00 7 | F 0 | Electives | 1 |
| | | | P 0 | | #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant |
| | | | I 0 | Other | 14 |
| | | | ? 0 | | |