

Course-Section: LING 190 0101  
 Title WORLD OF LANGUAGE  
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA  
 Enrollment: 53  
 Questionnaires: 42

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 969  
 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	4	0	1	2	10	13	12	3.87	1197/1470	3.87	4.22	4.29	4.13	3.87	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	4	0	1	0	7	15	15	4.13	938/1470	4.13	4.19	4.23	4.17	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	4	0	0	1	3	16	18	4.34	657/1252	4.34	4.29	4.27	4.21	4.34	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	4	34	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/1413	****	4.19	4.24	4.12	****	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	5	2	0	0	9	9	17	4.23	560/1391	4.23	4.09	4.02	3.96	4.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	5	35	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1347	****	4.05	4.10	4.01	****	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	5	0	0	2	5	6	24	4.41	576/1455	4.41	4.10	4.16	4.16	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	4	2	0	0	0	30	6	4.17	1311/1469	4.17	4.63	4.70	4.65	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	1	0	1	14	12	5	3.66	1151/1451	3.66	4.00	4.08	3.99	3.66	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	0	1	6	11	18	4.28	1001/1407	4.28	4.38	4.43	4.40	4.28	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	1	4	8	23	4.47	1133/1404	4.47	4.68	4.70	4.62	4.47	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	1	10	10	15	4.08	987/1401	4.08	4.24	4.28	4.22	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	2	0	2	10	8	14	4.00	1021/1398	4.00	4.27	4.27	4.21	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	6	0	1	9	6	14	4.10	571/1176	4.10	3.80	3.96	3.84	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	26	0	2	0	3	7	4	3.69	946/1276	3.69	4.10	4.06	3.81	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	25	0	5	0	2	4	6	3.35	1151/1277	3.35	4.42	4.30	4.02	3.35	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	25	0	1	2	4	4	6	3.71	1063/1271	3.71	4.31	4.28	4.02	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 15	Required for Majors	19
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 17		Graduate 0
56-83	10	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	3
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 42
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	15
			? 0		

Course-Section: LING 290 0101  
 Title INTRO TO APPLIED LING  
 Instructor: KA, OMAR  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 970  
 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	7	4.70	322/1470	4.70	4.22	4.29	4.28	4.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	632/1470	4.40	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.40	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	473/1252	4.50	4.29	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	313/1413	4.60	4.19	4.24	4.24	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	173/1391	4.70	4.09	4.02	3.97	4.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	164/1347	4.70	4.05	4.10	4.01	4.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	779/1455	4.22	4.10	4.16	4.20	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	833/1469	4.80	4.63	4.70	4.73	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	789/1451	4.10	4.00	4.08	4.04	4.10	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	516/1407	4.70	4.38	4.43	4.41	4.70	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.71	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	345/1401	4.70	4.24	4.28	4.26	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	504/1398	4.60	4.27	4.27	4.26	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	7	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1116/1176	2.67	3.80	3.96	3.99	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	499/1276	4.33	4.10	4.06	4.01	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.25	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	259/1271	4.83	4.31	4.28	4.25	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 763	****	3.98	4.06	3.98	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 2	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 1	Other	5

#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: LING 320 0101  
 Title SYNTAX  
 Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 971  
 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	7	4.88	134/1470	4.88	4.22	4.29	4.31	4.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	808/1470	4.25	4.19	4.23	4.22	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1252	5.00	4.29	4.27	4.27	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	123/1413	4.86	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.86	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	500/1391	4.29	4.09	4.02	4.00	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	264/1347	4.57	4.05	4.10	4.11	4.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	5	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	437/1455	4.50	4.10	4.16	4.12	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1327/1469	4.14	4.63	4.70	4.67	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	89/1451	4.83	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.38	4.43	4.41	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.69	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	319/1401	4.71	4.24	4.28	4.27	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.27	4.27	4.25	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	968/1176	3.33	3.80	3.96	3.97	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1276	4.83	4.10	4.06	4.10	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1271	5.00	4.31	4.28	4.33	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	99/ 763	4.75	3.98	4.06	4.07	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 0		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 3
Grad.	1	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 490 0101  
 Title SEM IN APPLIED LING  
 Instructor: MCCRAY, STANLEY  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2004

Page 972  
 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	3	4.40	680/1470	4.40	4.22	4.29	4.36	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1020/1470	4.00	4.19	4.23	4.25	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/1252	****	4.29	4.27	4.30	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	555/1413	4.40	4.19	4.24	4.27	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	736/1391	4.00	4.09	4.02	4.04	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	313/1347	4.50	4.05	4.10	4.15	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1455	5.00	4.10	4.16	4.15	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1469	5.00	4.63	4.70	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	624/1451	4.25	4.00	4.08	4.17	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	641/1407	4.60	4.38	4.43	4.47	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1404	5.00	4.68	4.70	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	193/1401	4.80	4.24	4.28	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	713/1398	4.40	4.27	4.27	4.33	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	615/1176	4.00	3.80	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	290/1276	4.60	4.10	4.06	4.19	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1277	5.00	4.42	4.30	4.46	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	283/1271	4.80	4.31	4.28	4.41	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	578/ 763	3.67	3.98	4.06	4.22	3.67	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	36/ 73	4.75	4.53	4.59	4.71	4.75	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	52/ 73	4.60	4.90	4.70	4.77	4.60	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	37/ 64	4.80	4.67	4.66	4.59	4.80	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	40/ 74	4.60	4.51	4.50	4.43	4.60	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	54/ 71	3.75	4.13	4.16	3.98	3.75	

Frequency Distribution

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