

Course-Section: LING 190 0101
 Title WORLD OF LANGUAGE
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 64
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 963
 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	5	2	8	10	14	3.67	1302/1504	3.67	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	8	9	16	3.82	1173/1503	3.82	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	4	1	8	9	16	3.84	1046/1290	3.84	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.84
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	6	4	7	1	7	14	3.61	1253/1453	3.61	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	7	11	17	3.97	780/1421	3.97	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.97
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	3	5	5	8	5	13	3.44	1181/1365	3.44	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	4	5	27	4.38	613/1485	4.38	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	1	18	17	4.44	1138/1504	4.44	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	5	3	12	11	4	3.17	1349/1483	3.17	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	2	9	10	15	3.82	1240/1425	3.82	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	1	6	7	22	4.13	1304/1426	4.13	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.13
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	5	2	10	13	8	3.45	1269/1418	3.45	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	6	4	8	9	11	3.39	1269/1416	3.39	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.39
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	6	4	9	8	10	3.32	990/1199	3.32	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.32
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	3	7	5	3	8	3.23	1099/1312	3.23	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.23
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	2	2	5	4	13	3.92	975/1303	3.92	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	3	0	8	3	12	3.81	1038/1299	3.81	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.81
4. Were special techniques successful	13	21	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.80	****
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	38	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99 1	A 14	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	9	1.00-1.99 1	B 14		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 9	General 2	Under-grad 39 Non-major 15
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 18	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 25	
			? 1		

Course-Section: LING 290 0101
 Title INTRO TO APPLIED LING
 Instructor: KA, OMAR
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 964
 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	Mean	Mean

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	482/1504	4.56	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	200/1503	4.78	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	588/1290	4.44	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.44
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	385/1453	4.56	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	479/1421	4.33	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	329/1485	4.63	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	668/1483	4.22	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	384/1425	4.78	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	790/1426	4.78	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	139/1418	4.89	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	296/1416	4.78	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/1199	****	3.95	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	9	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

Course-Section: LING 310 0101
 Title PHONOLOGY & MORPHOLOGY
 Instructor: KA, OMAR
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 965
 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	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	386/1504	4.64	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	707/1503	4.36	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	280/1290	4.73	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.73
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	385/1453	4.56	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	596/1421	4.20	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.20
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	525/1365	4.30	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	523/1485	4.45	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.45
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	668/1483	4.22	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	618/1425	4.64	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	714/1426	4.82	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	828/1418	4.27	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	485/1416	4.64	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	542/1199	4.20	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	217/1303	4.89	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	4	7	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 758	****	4.05	4.01	4.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	13	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LING 360 0101
 Title SOCIOLING & DIALECTOLO
 Instructor: FIELD, THOMAS T
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 966
 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	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	209/1503	4.77	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	400/1290	4.62	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	186/1453	4.77	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	151/1421	4.77	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.77
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	102/1365	4.85	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	423/1485	4.54	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	187/1483	4.70	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.70
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	161/1425	4.92	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	171/1418	4.83	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.27	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	429/1199	4.33	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	330/1312	4.56	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	3	1	1	2	3.29	642/ 758	3.29	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.29

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	4
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LING 470 0101
 Title LANGUAGE & COGNITION
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 967
 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	4	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.24	4.27	4.33	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.20	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	5.00	4.32	4.28	4.32	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.22	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.02	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1365	5.00	4.11	4.08	4.09	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	670/1485	4.33	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1274/1504	4.25	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	338/1483	4.50	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.38	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.72	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.25	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1416	5.00	4.34	4.26	4.26	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1199	5.00	3.95	3.97	4.05	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1312	5.00	4.12	4.00	4.07	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.38	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.17	5.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	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	4	Non-major	1
84-150	2	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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: LING 494 0101
 Title ESL/FL TEACHERS:SYNTAX
 Instructor: NELSON, JOHN E.
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 968
 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	Mean	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	176/1504	4.85	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	209/1503	4.77	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.77
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	311/1290	4.70	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	186/1453	4.77	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	548/1421	4.25	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	217/1365	4.62	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	78/1485	4.92	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	506/1483	4.36	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	270/1425	4.85	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	643/1426	4.85	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.85
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	247/1418	4.77	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	113/1416	4.92	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	795/1199	3.80	3.95	3.97	4.05	3.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	2	6	4.17	651/1312	4.17	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	4	1	7	4.25	796/1303	4.25	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	354/1299	4.75	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	1	4	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	6	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	7	Non-major	1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	6	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	# - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						