

Course-Section: ELC 041 8010
 Title ESL:WRITING & GRAMMAR
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 593
 JUN 14, 2004
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	3.50	1352/1470	3.50	4.22	4.29	4.13	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	1323/1470	3.50	4.19	4.23	4.17	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1166/1252	3.33	4.29	4.27	4.21	3.33	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	869/1413	4.17	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	622/1391	4.17	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	3.67	1094/1347	3.67	4.05	4.10	4.01	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	843/1455	4.17	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	1196/1469	4.33	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	845/1451	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	753/1407	4.50	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	936/1404	4.67	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	4.17	936/1401	4.17	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.17	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	783/1398	4.33	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	615/1176	4.00	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	344/1276	4.50	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	1012/1277	3.83	4.42	4.30	4.02	3.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	704/1271	4.33	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	1	0	1	2	2	3.67	578/ 763	3.67	3.98	4.06	3.92	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 236	****	4.18	4.22	4.02	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 042 8010
 Title ESL:READING & VOCAB DE
 Instructor: COLLINS, ELSA T
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 594
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	3	2	4.40	680/1470	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1020/1470	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	797/1252	4.20	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	840/1413	4.20	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	380/1391	4.40	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	421/1347	4.40	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	324/1455	4.60	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	1288/1469	4.20	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1090/1451	3.75	4.00	4.08	3.99	3.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	693/1404	4.80	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1401	4.75	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	894/1398	4.20	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.20	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	795/1176	3.75	3.80	3.96	3.84	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	429/1276	4.40	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	820/1277	4.20	4.42	4.30	4.02	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1034/1271	3.80	4.31	4.28	4.02	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	421/ 763	4.00	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 595
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	0	4.00	1080/1470	4.00	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1470	5.00	4.19	4.23	4.17	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	904/1252	4.00	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	986/1413	4.00	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	736/1391	4.00	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	771/1347	4.00	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1455	5.00	4.10	4.16	4.16	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	845/1451	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1401	5.00	4.24	4.28	4.22	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.21	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1176	5.00	3.80	3.96	3.84	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	710/1276	4.00	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	901/1277	4.00	4.42	4.30	4.02	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.02	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 763	5.00	3.98	4.06	3.92	5.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	150/ 236	4.00	4.18	4.22	4.02	4.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	164/ 248	4.00	4.08	4.23	4.12	4.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	177/ 233	4.00	4.54	4.33	4.15	4.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.17	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 214	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.13	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	57/ 73	4.00	4.53	4.59	4.40	4.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.88	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	54/ 64	4.00	4.67	4.66	4.83	4.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 74	5.00	4.51	4.50	4.56	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 71	5.00	4.13	4.16	4.29	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	27/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.34	4.44	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 42	5.00	4.60	4.17	4.29	5.00	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 37	5.00	4.60	4.48	4.71	5.00	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	21/ 35	4.00	4.40	4.18	3.71	4.00	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 30	5.00	4.60	4.30	4.60	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	32/ 45	4.00	3.47	4.42	4.03	4.00	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 34	5.00	4.60	4.48	4.71	5.00	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	35/ 43	4.00	4.40	4.62	4.70	4.00	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	26/ 31	4.00	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.00	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	20/ 23	4.00	4.40	4.66	4.40	4.00	

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 595
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 051 8010
 Title ESL:ADV WRITNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 596
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	6	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	1329/1470	3.66	4.22	4.29	4.13	3.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	6	0	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	1225/1470	3.77	4.19	4.23	4.17	3.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	6	1	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	1084/1252	3.74	4.29	4.27	4.21	3.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	727/1413	4.10	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	736/1391	3.79	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	533/1347	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	6	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	864/1455	4.15	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	6	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	743/1469	4.80	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1018/1451	3.68	4.00	4.08	3.99	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	861/1407	4.40	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	1256/1404	4.05	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1022/1401	3.90	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	2	2	3.86	1120/1398	3.83	4.27	4.27	4.21	3.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	1	0	0	4	2	0	3.33	968/1176	3.23	3.80	3.96	3.84	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1276	3.30	4.10	4.06	3.81	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1277	3.09	4.42	4.30	4.02	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/1271	3.45	4.31	4.28	4.02	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 763	3.73	3.98	4.06	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: ELC 051 8011
 Title ESL:ADV WRTNG & GRAMMA
 Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 597
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	2	0	2	0	1	5	4	3.75	1256/1470	3.66	4.22	4.29	4.13	3.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1156/1470	3.77	4.19	4.23	4.17	3.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	1029/1252	3.74	4.29	4.27	4.21	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1108/1413	4.10	4.19	4.24	4.12	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1085/1391	3.79	4.09	4.02	3.96	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	0	0	7	1	3.27	1242/1347	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.01	3.27	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	1	7	4.17	843/1455	4.15	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	882/1469	4.80	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1216/1451	3.68	4.00	4.08	3.99	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	0	0	3	7	4.36	925/1407	4.40	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	2	1	5	3	3.82	1359/1404	4.05	4.68	4.70	4.62	3.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1162/1401	3.90	4.24	4.28	4.22	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	1	6	2	3.80	1143/1398	3.83	4.27	4.27	4.21	3.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	2	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1020/1176	3.23	3.80	3.96	3.84	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	1	4	2	3.30	1092/1276	3.30	4.10	4.06	3.81	3.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	4	1	3	2	3.09	1196/1277	3.09	4.42	4.30	4.02	3.09	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	1	2	6	1	3.45	1123/1271	3.45	4.31	4.28	4.02	3.45	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	1	8	1	3.73	555/ 763	3.73	3.98	4.06	3.92	3.73	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	10	0.00-0.99 1	A 2	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 1	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 9	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ELC 052 8010
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 598
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	3	0	0	0	4	3	1	3.63	1313/1470	3.81	4.22	4.29	4.13	3.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	1	2	4	1	3.63	1264/1470	3.91	4.19	4.23	4.17	3.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	2	1	4	1	3.50	1120/1252	3.80	4.29	4.27	4.21	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	907/1413	4.16	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	3	0	3.38	1193/1391	3.79	4.09	4.02	3.96	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	1030/1347	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.01	3.75	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	1369/1455	3.40	4.10	4.16	4.16	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	882/1469	4.73	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	5	1	3.88	1003/1451	3.74	4.00	4.08	3.99	3.88	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1017/1407	4.18	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.25	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	1269/1404	4.24	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.25	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	1022/1401	4.00	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1164/1398	3.76	4.27	4.27	4.21	3.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	3	0	3	2	0	2.50	1125/1176	2.88	3.80	3.96	3.84	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	857/1276	3.72	4.10	4.06	3.81	3.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	3	0	2	3.33	1157/1277	3.62	4.42	4.30	4.02	3.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	3	2	4.00	881/1271	4.05	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	3	2	1	3.67	578/ 763	3.93	3.98	4.06	3.92	3.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 3		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 11 Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 2	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 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: ELC 052 8011
 Title ESL:ADV READING & VOCA
 Instructor: GRISHAM, COLLEE
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 599
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	0	2	0	4	4	4.00	1080/1470	3.81	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	873/1470	3.91	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	860/1252	3.80	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.10	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	840/1413	4.16	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	590/1391	3.79	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	0	4	4	3.80	990/1347	3.78	4.05	4.10	4.01	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	0	2	5	3.80	1141/1455	3.40	4.10	4.16	4.16	3.80	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	938/1469	4.73	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.70	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	3	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	1175/1451	3.74	4.00	4.08	3.99	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	1119/1407	4.18	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	1282/1404	4.24	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	6	2	4.00	1022/1401	4.00	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1155/1398	3.76	4.27	4.27	4.21	3.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	989/1176	2.88	3.80	3.96	3.84	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	986/1276	3.72	4.10	4.06	3.81	3.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	0	3	5	3.90	987/1277	3.62	4.42	4.30	4.02	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	1	3	5	4.10	852/1271	4.05	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	350/ 763	3.93	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.20	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	8	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 600
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	2	4.25	868/1470	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	470/1470	4.50	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1413	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	279/1391	4.50	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	563/1347	4.25	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	260/1455	4.67	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	845/1451	4.00	4.00	4.08	3.99	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1407	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	263/1401	4.94	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	300/1398	4.94	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	253/1176	4.38	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	572/1276	4.25	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.02	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	569/1271	4.50	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	177/ 763	4.50	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 236	5.00	4.18	4.22	4.02	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 248	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.12	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.54	4.33	4.15	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.17	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 214	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.13	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	70/ 73	3.75	4.53	4.59	4.40	3.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.88	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	4.67	4.66	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	43/ 74	4.50	4.51	4.50	4.56	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 71	4.50	4.13	4.16	4.29	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	27/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.34	4.44	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	13/ 42	4.50	4.60	4.17	4.29	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	20/ 37	4.50	4.60	4.48	4.71	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	9/ 35	4.50	4.40	4.18	3.71	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	12/ 30	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.60	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	40/ 45	3.33	3.47	4.42	4.03	3.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 34	4.50	4.60	4.48	4.71	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 43	4.50	4.40	4.62	4.70	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 31	4.50	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 23	4.50	4.40	4.66	4.40	4.50	

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: BRASS, DORRIE A (Instr. A)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 600
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	0	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	2	Non-major	1
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 601
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	2	4.25	868/1470	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	470/1470	4.50	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1413	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	279/1391	4.50	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	563/1347	4.25	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	260/1455	4.67	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1161/1407	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1401	4.94	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1398	4.94	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1176	4.38	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	572/1276	4.25	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.02	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	569/1271	4.50	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	177/ 763	4.50	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 236	5.00	4.18	4.22	4.02	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 248	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.12	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.54	4.33	4.15	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.17	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 214	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.13	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	70/ 73	3.75	4.53	4.59	4.40	3.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.88	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	4.67	4.66	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	43/ 74	4.50	4.51	4.50	4.56	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 71	4.50	4.13	4.16	4.29	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	27/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.34	4.44	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	13/ 42	4.50	4.60	4.17	4.29	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	20/ 37	4.50	4.60	4.48	4.71	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	9/ 35	4.50	4.40	4.18	3.71	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	12/ 30	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.60	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	40/ 45	3.33	3.47	4.42	4.03	3.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 34	4.50	4.60	4.48	4.71	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 43	4.50	4.40	4.62	4.70	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 31	4.50	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 23	4.50	4.40	4.66	4.40	4.50	

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: (Instr. B)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 601
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	0	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	2	Non-major	1
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 602
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	2	4.25	868/1470	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	470/1470	4.50	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1413	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	279/1391	4.50	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	563/1347	4.25	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	260/1455	4.67	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1401	4.94	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	4.94	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	1034/1176	4.38	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	572/1276	4.25	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.02	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	569/1271	4.50	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	177/ 763	4.50	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 236	5.00	4.18	4.22	4.02	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 248	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.12	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.54	4.33	4.15	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.17	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 214	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.13	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	70/ 73	3.75	4.53	4.59	4.40	3.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.88	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	4.67	4.66	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	43/ 74	4.50	4.51	4.50	4.56	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 71	4.50	4.13	4.16	4.29	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	27/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.34	4.44	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	13/ 42	4.50	4.60	4.17	4.29	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	20/ 37	4.50	4.60	4.48	4.71	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	9/ 35	4.50	4.40	4.18	3.71	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	12/ 30	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.60	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	40/ 45	3.33	3.47	4.42	4.03	3.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 34	4.50	4.60	4.48	4.71	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 43	4.50	4.40	4.62	4.70	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 31	4.50	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 23	4.50	4.40	4.66	4.40	4.50	

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: (Instr. C)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 602
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	0	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	2	Non-major	1
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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 603
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	1	2	4.25	868/1470	4.25	4.22	4.29	4.13	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	470/1470	4.50	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	766/1413	4.25	4.19	4.24	4.12	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	279/1391	4.50	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	563/1347	4.25	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.25	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	260/1455	4.67	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.65	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	4.75	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.62	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1401	4.94	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.94	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	4.94	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1176	4.38	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	572/1276	4.25	4.10	4.06	3.81	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.02	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	569/1271	4.50	4.31	4.28	4.02	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	177/ 763	4.50	3.98	4.06	3.92	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 236	5.00	4.18	4.22	4.02	5.00	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 248	5.00	4.08	4.23	4.12	5.00	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 233	5.00	4.54	4.33	4.15	5.00	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 232	5.00	4.33	4.28	4.17	5.00	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 214	5.00	4.29	4.16	4.13	5.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	70/ 73	3.75	4.53	4.59	4.40	3.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 73	5.00	4.90	4.70	4.88	5.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 64	5.00	4.67	4.66	4.83	5.00	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	43/ 74	4.50	4.51	4.50	4.56	4.50	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	27/ 71	4.50	4.13	4.16	4.29	4.50	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	27/ 45	4.00	4.00	4.34	4.44	4.00	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	13/ 42	4.50	4.60	4.17	4.29	4.50	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	20/ 37	4.50	4.60	4.48	4.71	4.50	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	9/ 35	4.50	4.40	4.18	3.71	4.50	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	12/ 30	4.50	4.60	4.30	4.60	4.50	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	40/ 45	3.33	3.47	4.42	4.03	3.33	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	18/ 34	4.50	4.60	4.48	4.71	4.50	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	28/ 43	4.50	4.40	4.62	4.70	4.50	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	21/ 31	4.50	4.40	4.71	4.63	4.50	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	14/ 23	4.50	4.40	4.66	4.40	4.50	

Course-Section: ELC 073 8010
 Title ADV ORAL PRESENTATION
 Instructor: (Instr. D)
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2004

Page 603
 JUN 14, 2004
 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	0	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	2	Non-major	1
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	1				
				?	0						