

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: PEREZ-REYNA  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1373  
 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	2	2	8	5	6	3.48	1366/1481	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.48	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	6	8	3.74	1216/1481	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.74	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	5	4	9	3.70	1073/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	7	4	3	8	3.43	1291/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	4	7	2	6	3.18	1228/1396	3.50	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	5	6	8	3.78	968/1342	3.86	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.78	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	6	5	6	3.35	1315/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	4	12	5	4.05	1339/1480	4.53	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.05	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	2	3	8	2	3.50	1223/1450	3.87	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	5	5	10	4.00	1152/1409	4.21	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	1153/1407	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	3	3	1	5	9	3.67	1196/1399	4.07	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	5	10	4.00	1017/1400	4.36	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	4	8	6	3.80	760/1179	3.66	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.80	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	6	11	4.30	537/1262	4.12	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	2	15	4.60	509/1259	4.55	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.60	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	571/1256	4.45	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	2	2	1	3	9	3.88	492/ 788	4.20	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.88	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: PEREZ-REYNA  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1373  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	11	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: PEREZ-REYNA  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1374  
 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	1	0	3	4	13	4.33	749/1481	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	4	14	4.43	632/1481	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.43	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	535/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.48	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	863/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	4	3	9	3.62	1018/1396	3.50	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.62	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	4	10	4.05	731/1342	3.86	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.05	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	436/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.52	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	0	12	7	4.14	1295/1480	4.53	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	2	1	1	8	4.00	836/1450	3.87	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	5	11	4.14	1098/1409	4.21	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	20	4.90	500/1407	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	4	1	1	15	4.29	801/1399	4.07	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	3	0	16	4.55	541/1400	4.36	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	3	4	1	9	3.78	780/1179	3.66	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	1	10	4.20	610/1262	4.12	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	2	12	4.67	451/1259	4.55	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	1	2	11	4.47	614/1256	4.45	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.47	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	89/ 788	4.20	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7	
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C 0	General 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 21
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 14
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 0
					Other 5

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

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: GRANENA  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1375  
 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	1	8	5	12	4.08	1024/1481	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.08	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	7	9	3.85	1154/1481	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	4	12	7	3.88	988/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	2	5	7	9	3.76	1181/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.76	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	1	5	3	4	7	3.55	1054/1396	3.50	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.55	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	6	5	4	9	3.67	1039/1342	3.86	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	7	8	10	4.00	961/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	561/1480	4.53	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	7	7	4	3.74	1115/1450	3.87	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.74	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	3	9	11	4.16	1086/1409	4.21	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.16	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	5	18	4.60	1031/1407	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	7	6	10	3.92	1077/1399	4.07	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	6	14	4.29	836/1400	4.36	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	4	2	6	7	3	3.14	1029/1179	3.66	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	7	6	6	3.76	882/1262	4.12	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	3	0	1	2	15	4.24	796/1259	4.55	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.24	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	4	5	11	4.19	809/1256	4.45	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.19	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	6	7	5	3.70	552/ 788	4.20	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.70	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	1	0	1	1	3.67	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	1	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	1	1	0	0	1	2.67	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: GRANENA  
 Enrollment: 32  
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1375  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	5	Under-grad	26	Non-major	7
84-150	11	3.00-3.49	8	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1376  
 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	3	3	10	4.44	639/1481	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	10	4.50	517/1481	4.13	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	13	4.69	310/1249	4.19	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	10	4.44	521/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	4	2	6	3.67	985/1396	3.50	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	2	9	3.94	845/1342	3.86	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	647/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	4.53	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	630/1450	3.87	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	727/1409	4.21	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.53	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	614/1407	4.70	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	1	10	4.40	683/1399	4.07	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	1	12	4.60	492/1400	4.36	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	1	4	1	8	3.93	661/1179	3.66	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	2	9	4.21	596/1262	4.12	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.21	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	402/1259	4.55	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	2	1	11	4.64	477/1256	4.45	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.64	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	2	1	10	4.43	209/ 788	4.20	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.43	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1376  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	5	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: PETERSON, M.  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1377  
 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	1	3	5	4	2	3.20	1426/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	7	2	2	3.14	1404/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	3	4	3.40	1136/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.40	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	5	3	3	3.27	1331/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.27	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	3	3	2	3.00	1292/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	2	5	2	2	2.86	1310/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	2.86	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	2	2	3	4	3.07	1373/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.07	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	7	4.47	1072/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	5	2	1	3.20	1320/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	8	3	2	3.54	1289/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.54	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1137/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	7	3	0	2.92	1343/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	2.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	3	4	3	3.46	1240/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	1	3	2	2	2.91	1087/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	2.91	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	2	4	1	2	3.33	1059/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	803/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.22	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	2	1	4	3.78	1035/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	2	1	3	1	3.43	640/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.43	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 15 Non-major 2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 3	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		



Course-Section: SPAN 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: NOGUERIA, B  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1378  
 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	2	2	4	11	2	3.43	1380/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	10	3	3.52	1313/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.52	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	7	6	5	3.57	1102/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.57	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	3	3	2	7	4	3.32	1321/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	6	2	6	5	3.40	1136/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	7	5	4	3.29	1200/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	695/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	2	19	0	3.90	1420/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	9	4	3.89	989/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	4	10	6	4.00	1152/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	975/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.65	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	6	10	4.14	929/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	791/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	4	4	1	4	4	3.00	1041/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	487/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.36	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	325/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.79	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	742/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.31	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	2	3	0	6	3.91	487/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.91	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	12
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 6	Graduate	0
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 8	Under-grad	21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0	Non-major	8
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	5

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1379  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	6	9	7	3.88	1180/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	11	8	4.00	1000/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	10	11	4.29	710/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	7	10	4.09	918/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	8	6	5	3.67	985/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	2	6	4	9	3.70	1023/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.70	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	2	4	15	4.35	683/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.35	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	22	1	4.04	1339/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.04	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	751/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	6	12	4.32	990/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	5	15	4.55	1076/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	6	11	4.18	892/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	7	12	4.36	754/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	2	5	3	5	3	3.11	1035/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	570/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	4	1	10	4.25	783/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	2	0	3	2	9	4.00	901/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	3	2	0	3	3	5	3.69	555/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.69	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	23	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0301  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 30  
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1379  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	7	General	2	Under-grad	24	Non-major	4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: PETERSON, M  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1380  
 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	2	5	3	3	3.54	1347/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1154/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	5	3	3.85	1005/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.85	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	3	3.92	1061/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	4	1	2	3	2	2.83	1337/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	2.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	5	4	2	3.50	1115/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1187/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.69	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	1079/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.45	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	836/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	1043/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.23	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	1019/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.62	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	920/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.15	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	791/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	2	0	0	1	3	3.50	894/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	1	1	4	3.88	816/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	571/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	1	1	4	1	3.71	548/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 3		Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 1	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0501  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: NOGUERIA, B  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1381  
 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	2	0	5	8	3	3.56	1341/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	7	6	3.89	1130/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	1	7	7	3.89	988/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.89	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	8	4	3.88	1101/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	6	7	4	3.72	942/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.72	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	7	5	3.88	905/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	11	6	4.28	757/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	13	2	3.94	1391/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	0	3	9	2	3.73	1115/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.73	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	7	7	4.06	1137/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	785/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	4	6	6	3.83	1130/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.83	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	7	8	4.17	937/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.17	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	3	2	4	3	2	2.93	1077/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	2.93	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	1	4	7	4.07	684/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	588/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	658/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	1	0	5	1	6	3.85	503/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.85	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0501  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: NOGUERIA, B  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1381  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	17	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1382  
 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	3	2	2	8	8	3.70	1287/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.70	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	2	5	12	4.09	967/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.09	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	4	5	6	8	3.78	1031/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	8	9	3.91	1074/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.91	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	4	0	6	8	3.70	959/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.70	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	0	3	9	7	3.90	884/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.90	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	7	7	9	4.09	919/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	756/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.87	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	3	6	9	4.05	808/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.05	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	1	5	10	4.00	1152/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	1	16	4.60	1031/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.60	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	0	6	9	3.90	1096/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.90	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	0	1	4	11	4.05	1001/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.05	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	2	5	4	6	3.67	840/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	3	2	9	3	3.71	913/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	2	1	4	9	4.25	783/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	2	1	3	11	4.35	711/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.35	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	3	0	2	4	6	3.67	564/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	22	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1382  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	9	General	5	Under-grad	23	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						



Course-Section: SPAN 102 0701  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1383  
 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	0	4	1	8	6	3.84	1199/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	7	5	3.84	1154/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.84	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	7	8	4.11	854/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	7	7	4.17	840/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.17	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	4	5	5	3.32	1176/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.32	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	638/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.16	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	3	6	7	3.94	1013/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	14	4	4.22	1238/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.22	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	2	0	0	4	6	4	4.00	836/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	603/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	997/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	2	9	6	4.00	1002/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	0	9	8	4.21	898/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	1	6	5	4	3.75	793/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	358/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	571/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	324/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.18	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 2	C 5	General 2	Under-grad 20 Non-major 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 1	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 6	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SIMMORANG, KIR  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1384  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	1	2	7	4	6	3.60	1324/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	4	11	4.15	917/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.15	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	6	5	7	3.80	1022/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	3	8	6	3.75	1186/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	5	6	2	3.11	1266/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.11	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	6	5	6	3.65	1044/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	5	4	10	4.10	909/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.10	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	0	19	4.85	770/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	1	10	2	4.08	797/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	1	4	10	4.18	1080/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	0	2	13	4.69	941/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.69	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	2	2	2	9	4.00	1002/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	0	3	10	4.13	969/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	1	2	5	4	4	3.50	894/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	2	1	6	6	3.88	816/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	4	1	9	4.00	895/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	2	2	2	10	4.25	773/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	2	0	3	2	7	3.86	501/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	17	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SIMMORANG, KIR  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1384  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	13
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0901  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: DELOSRIOS, C.  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1385  
 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	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	749/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.33	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	324/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	13	4.61	393/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	326/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.61	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	675/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	424/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.39	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	460/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	10	5	4.18	1274/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.18	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	836/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	500/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	682/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	322/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	299/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	2	4	2	5	3.57	870/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	2	0	9	4.42	427/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	294/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	394/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	1	0	2	1	7	4.18	324/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.18	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.18	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.17	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	****	****	
Self Paced															
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0901  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: DELOSRIOS, C.  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1385  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	19	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 1001  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: DEANGULO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1386  
 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	1	0	2	6	9	4.22	883/1481	3.73	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.22	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	603/1481	3.96	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.44	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	11	4.39	639/1249	3.97	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.39	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	9	4.44	509/1424	3.94	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.44	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	3	9	4.06	675/1396	3.49	4.07	3.98	3.89	4.06	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	4	9	4.11	683/1342	3.74	4.12	4.07	3.88	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	757/1459	4.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	7	4.39	1126/1480	4.33	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.39	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	662/1450	3.93	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.22	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	559/1409	4.23	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	785/1407	4.66	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	636/1399	4.03	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	791/1400	4.21	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.33	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	3	5	4	3.53	883/1179	3.35	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.53	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	3	7	4.15	638/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.15	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	358/1259	4.52	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	506/1256	4.35	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.62	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	503/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	3.80	3.85	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	3.93	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	3.95	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.33	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.20	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.02	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.80	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	4.58	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 1001  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: DEANGULO  
 Enrollment: 25  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1386  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 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	3	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	12						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	1
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0101  
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH  
 Instructor: MORENILLA, L.  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1387  
 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	1	1	4	7	6	3.84	1199/1481	4.07	4.26	4.29	4.14	3.84	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	10	3	3.68	1242/1481	4.02	4.26	4.23	4.18	3.68	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	8	8	4.11	854/1249	3.99	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	6	7	5	3.94	1035/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	0	4	5	5	3.69	972/1396	3.66	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.69	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	832/1342	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.94	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	863/1459	4.28	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.16	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1480	4.76	4.64	4.68	4.64	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	10	8	0	3.44	1249/1450	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.97	3.44	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	6	8	5	3.95	1191/1409	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.36	3.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	7	10	4.26	1253/1407	4.60	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.26	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	9	5	4	3.63	1206/1399	4.13	4.30	4.26	4.23	3.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	8	6	3.79	1130/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.19	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	8	6	2	3.33	972/1179	3.38	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1108/1262	3.80	4.18	4.05	3.77	3.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	2	7	4.08	872/1259	4.33	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.08	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	901/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	197/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	4.45	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.54	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.14	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.00	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	3.44	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.48	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.42	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	7	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 15
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 13	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D 0	Under-grad 19
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Non-major 2
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 0	Electives 0
					Other 1

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



Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201  
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH  
 Instructor: NASH, L.  
 Enrollment: 27  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1388  
 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	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	792/1481	4.07	4.26	4.29	4.14	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	4	10	4.35	715/1481	4.02	4.26	4.23	4.18	4.35	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	4	2	3	8	3.88	988/1249	3.99	4.37	4.27	4.14	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	4	8	4.06	933/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.06	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1011/1396	3.66	4.07	3.98	3.89	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	7	3	6	3.82	941/1342	3.88	4.12	4.07	3.88	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	595/1459	4.28	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	1034/1480	4.76	4.64	4.68	4.64	4.53	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	311/1450	3.99	4.10	4.09	3.97	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	693/1409	4.25	4.46	4.42	4.36	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	350/1407	4.60	4.77	4.69	4.57	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	0	3	12	4.63	431/1399	4.13	4.30	4.26	4.23	4.63	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	531/1400	4.18	4.35	4.27	4.19	4.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	939/1179	3.38	3.94	3.96	3.85	3.42	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	418/1262	3.80	4.18	4.05	3.77	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	532/1259	4.33	4.40	4.29	4.06	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.08	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	3	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/ 788	4.45	4.03	4.00	3.80	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	5				
			? 2						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: NASH, L.  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1389  
 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	2	9	4.82	225/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	115/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	270/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.73	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	310/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	459/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	504/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	1	8	4.45	535/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	702/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	107/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.89	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	319/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	500/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	212/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	146/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	0	2	0	2	3.00	1041/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	570/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	783/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	1	0	1	0	6	4.25	773/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	133/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	7
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 3	General	0
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: GLYNN, DOUG  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1390  
 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	1	3	6	6	4.06	1031/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1082/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	7	5	3.94	953/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	1	7	5	4.00	959/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	3	5	3.38	1149/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	8	5	4.00	755/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	6	6	3.94	1021/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	15	0	3.94	1398/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	3.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	945/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.93	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	865/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	11	4.64	986/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	9	3	4.00	1002/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	7	4.21	898/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	2	0	3	6	2	3.46	914/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	507/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	451/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	543/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.56	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	209/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.43	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 16	Non-major 0
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 5		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0301  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, A.  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1391  
 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	2	0	6	8	4.25	844/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	693/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.38	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	498/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.50		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	6	4.06	928/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.06	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1065/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	3	6	3.81	948/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.81	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	775/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	459/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	865/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	400/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	929/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	681/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	2	5	3.75	793/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	507/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	451/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	826/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	254/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 3	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 3	C 5	General 1	Under-grad 16 Non-major 0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49 9	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0401  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: NASH, L.  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1392  
 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	3	15	4.74	316/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.74	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	14	4.53	493/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	4.53	479/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	4	11	4.32	671/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.32	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	5	4	7	3.74	934/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.74	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	444/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	3	13	4.32	719/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.32	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	974/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	217/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	466/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.72	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	545/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	14	4.67	376/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	0	16	4.78	287/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.78	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	2	1	4	0	2	2.89	1089/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.89	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	427/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	358/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	457/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	394/ 788	4.28	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 0	A 4	Required for Majors 12	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 14		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 6	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 1
84-150	8	3.00-3.49 4	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: SPAN 201 0501  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1393  
 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	1	0	1	7	8	4.24	870/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.24	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	7	9	4.41	646/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	423/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	620/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.35	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	3	8	3.94	772/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	3	4	7	4.07	719/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	0	4	10	4.38	647/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	12	3	4.20	1260/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	459/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	588/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.64	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	614/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	976/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.08	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	766/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.36	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	2	3	6	4.00	590/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	862/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	422/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	680/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	218/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	4
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	5				
			? 1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0601  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1394  
 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	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	439/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	274/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	4.71	287/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	318/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	297/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	1	11	4.44	374/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	836/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.19	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1044/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	3	6	7	4.06	808/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.06	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	1	4	11	4.41	878/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	1	3	12	4.47	601/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	14	4.65	444/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.65	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	233/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	1	0	5	4.29	550/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	257/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	256/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	117/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 6	C 8	General 0	Under-grad 17 Non-major 0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 4	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 8	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0701  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, A.  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1395  
 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	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	708/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.38	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	446/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	381/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	4	8	4.33	645/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	831/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	3	5	7	4.06	719/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	647/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	311/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.54	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	334/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	728/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	289/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	187/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	557/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.10	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	289/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.62	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	347/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.77	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	428/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	2	7	4.45	197/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 4	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 1	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 5	
			? 1		



Course-Section: SPAN 201 0801  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: GLYNN, DOUG  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1396  
 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	5	15	4.75	292/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	115/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.90	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	219/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	217/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	11	4.35	419/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	3	13	4.53	290/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.53	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	175/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.79	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	5	4.21	1245/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.21	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	131/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.82	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	290/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	145/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.89	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	166/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.89	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	3	1	9	4.29	419/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	325/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	294/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	394/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	166/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.55	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	20	Non-major	3
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	5	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1397  
 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	1	0	4	2	9	4.13	986/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.13	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	14	4.81	176/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.81	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	203/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	334/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.60	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	493/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	0	4	9	4.50	303/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	210/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.73	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	6	4.40	1114/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.40	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	334/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	682/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	335/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	299/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.77	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	692/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.90	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	205/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	238/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	496/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	145/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.63	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 5	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 4
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 6	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 1		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1398  
 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	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	522/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	324/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	470/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	485/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	6	4	4	3.86	839/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.86	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	4	4	6	4.14	649/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.14	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	1	3	2	8	4.00	961/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	12	2	3.93	1398/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	3.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	164/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.75	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4.63	618/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	705/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.81	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	10	4.50	567/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	312/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	4	5	4	4.00	590/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	305/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	358/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	2	9	4.50	571/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	105/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.75	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.37	4.20	4.58	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 217	****	4.42	4.04	4.28	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	5.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****		
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	3.68	4.26	4.69	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	3.50	4.42	4.80	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	4.28	4.75	4.50	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 34	****	4.50	4.83	4.43	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	4.50	4.82	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1398  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	2	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	5	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, BETTY  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1399  
 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	2	2	2	3	5	3.50	1358/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	1	4	5	3.57	1296/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	7	5	4.07	865/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	8	4	4.00	959/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	0	0	6	4	3.43	1125/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	3	6	3	3.57	1084/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	3	6	3.86	1086/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	1100/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.43	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1209/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1261/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	2	1	9	4.14	1286/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.14	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	3	4	3	3.29	1288/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	1	4	6	3.79	1130/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	6	0	4	1	0	2.00	1156/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	0	2	5	3.70	913/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	751/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.30	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1035/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	2	1	3	3	1	3.00	713/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 246	****	4.26	4.20	4.51	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 242	****	4.45	4.40	4.63	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MITCHELL, BETTY  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1400  
 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	1	2	7	5	3	3.39	1392/1481	4.28	4.26	4.29	4.40	3.39	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	7	4	4	3.39	1366/1481	4.40	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.39	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1013/1249	4.47	4.37	4.27	4.36	3.82	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	6	6	5	3.83	1138/1424	4.33	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	5	8	1	4	3.22	1210/1396	3.86	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.22	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	7	6	2	3.47	1130/1342	4.10	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	845/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	9	4.50	1044/1480	4.47	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	5	6	0	3.23	1312/1450	4.31	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.23	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	1110/1409	4.51	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	6	2	7	3.94	1315/1407	4.74	4.77	4.69	4.78	3.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	5	4	5	3.69	1189/1399	4.33	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	867/1400	4.55	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	7	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1114/1179	3.55	3.94	3.96	4.05	2.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	5	4	2	3.73	902/1262	4.28	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	2	5	3	3.91	978/1259	4.61	4.40	4.29	4.34	3.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	901/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	6	2	2	3.45	627/ 788	4.28	4.03	4.00	3.98	3.45	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
-----					
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 7		
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1401  
 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	2	2	6	4.40	678/1481	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.40	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	399/1481	4.26	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	142/1249	4.59	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	178/1424	4.36	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.80	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	459/1396	3.80	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.30	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	303/1342	4.17	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	0	8	4.60	344/1459	3.73	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	1260/1480	4.02	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.20	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	546/1450	4.02	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	3	3	3.78	1245/1409	3.89	4.46	4.42	4.47	3.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1407	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	1002/1399	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	312/1400	4.34	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	1	1	5	1	3.75	793/1179	3.61	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	345/1262	4.16	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	588/1259	4.57	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	723/1256	4.17	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	105/ 788	4.48	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors	4 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives	1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1402  
 JUN 13, 2006  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	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	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1248/1481	4.08	4.26	4.29	4.40	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	5	5	3.93	1094/1481	4.26	4.26	4.23	4.29	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	8	4.29	718/1249	4.59	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.29	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	2	7	3	3.92	1061/1424	4.36	4.27	4.21	4.28	3.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	1181/1396	3.80	4.07	3.98	3.94	3.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	7	3	3.85	927/1342	4.17	4.12	4.07	4.05	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	5	3	1	2.86	1409/1459	3.73	4.19	4.16	4.17	2.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	2	10	0	3.83	1429/1480	4.02	4.64	4.68	4.68	3.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	1	5	5	3	3.71	1133/1450	4.02	4.10	4.09	4.15	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	6	5	4.00	1152/1409	3.89	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1053/1407	4.79	4.77	4.69	4.78	4.57	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1125/1399	3.92	4.30	4.26	4.29	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	6	3.93	1074/1400	4.34	4.35	4.27	4.34	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	1	3	3	4	3.46	914/1179	3.61	3.94	3.96	4.05	3.46	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	5	3	3.82	855/1262	4.16	4.18	4.05	4.11	3.82	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	1	0	1	9	4.64	480/1259	4.57	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	2	0	1	1	7	4.00	901/1256	4.17	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	318/ 788	4.48	4.03	4.00	3.98	4.20	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 249	****	4.08	4.11	4.32	****	
Seminar															
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.83	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.00	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.72	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	3.55	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 59	****	3.92	4.30	4.67	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 51	****	4.04	4.00	4.07	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	5.00	4.60	4.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 55	****	3.90	4.55	4.44	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 51	****	4.42	4.65	4.66	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4	Required for Majors 5
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 9	
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Non-major 5
				P 0	
				I 0	
				? 1	Electives 1
					Other 3

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



Course-Section: SPAN 202H 0101  
 Title INTERMED SPAN II HONR  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 6  
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1403  
 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	6	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.40	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	162/1481	4.83	4.26	4.23	4.29	4.83	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	334/1249	4.67	4.37	4.27	4.36	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.27	4.21	4.28	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	193/1396	4.67	4.07	3.98	3.94	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	190/1342	4.67	4.12	4.07	4.05	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	460/1459	4.50	4.19	4.16	4.17	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4.17	1281/1480	4.17	4.64	4.68	4.68	4.17	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	259/1450	4.60	4.10	4.09	4.15	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	334/1409	4.80	4.46	4.42	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	212/1399	4.80	4.30	4.26	4.29	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	250/1400	4.80	4.35	4.27	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	442/1179	4.25	3.94	3.96	4.05	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	345/1262	4.50	4.18	4.05	4.11	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.28	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	604/ 788	3.50	4.03	4.00	3.98	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	4
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1404  
 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	1	2	1	4	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	822/1481	4.25	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	498/1249	4.50	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	533/1424	4.43	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	363/1396	4.43	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1337/1459	3.25	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	741/1450	4.14	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	762/1409	4.50	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.67	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	947/1399	4.13	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	867/1400	4.25	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	177/1179	4.67	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	236/1262	4.71	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	89/788	4.80	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 2	Required for Majors	1 Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General	2 Under-grad 8 Non-major 1
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	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	3
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II  
 Instructor: AREVALO GUERRERO  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1405  
 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	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	7	4	3.94	1082/1481	3.94	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	953/1249	3.94	4.37	4.27	4.28	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	3	9	4.31	671/1424	4.31	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	823/1396	3.88	4.07	3.98	4.00	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	5	3	8	4.19	603/1342	4.19	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.19	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	7	1	4	3	3.06	1373/1459	3.06	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.06	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	491/1480	4.94	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	797/1450	4.07	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	990/1409	4.31	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	350/1407	4.94	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	7	5	4.06	980/1399	4.06	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	969/1400	4.13	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	786/1179	3.77	3.94	3.96	4.02	3.77	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	507/1262	4.33	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	643/1259	4.44	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	723/1256	4.33	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	347/ 788	4.14	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.14	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 69	****	4.19	4.35	4.48	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	3.98	3.92	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	1	Other	11				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 304 0101  
 Title SPANISH FOR SPAN SPEAK  
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1406  
 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	1	0	2	5	8	4.19	928/1481	4.19	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.19	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	3	8	4.06	975/1481	4.06	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	869/1249	4.06	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	818/1424	4.19	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.19	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	7	7	4.19	564/1396	4.19	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	845/1342	3.93	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	3	2	3	2	5	3.27	1335/1459	3.27	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	797/1450	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	924/1409	4.38	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.38	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	1160/1407	4.44	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.44	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	3	3	8	4.06	980/1399	4.06	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.06	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	9	4.38	741/1400	4.38	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	3	1	2	4	5	3.47	914/1179	3.47	3.94	3.96	4.02	3.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	617/1262	4.18	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.18	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	2	2	1	6	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	1	2	3	5	3.83	506/ 788	3.83	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.83	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101  
 Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS  
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1407  
 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	1	1	4	6	4.25	844/1481	4.25	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	2	3.50	1320/1481	3.50	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	7	2	3.75	1186/1424	3.75	4.27	4.21	4.27	3.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	1	6	4.08	655/1396	4.08	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.08	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	3	3.83	934/1342	3.83	4.12	4.07	4.12	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	1	5	3.58	1233/1459	3.58	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.58	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.65	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	2	2	5	1	3.27	1301/1450	3.27	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.27	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	3	1	6	4.09	1125/1409	4.09	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.09	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	1205/1407	4.36	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	3	2	5	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.27	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	5	1	4	3.64	1193/1400	3.64	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	560/1179	4.09	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	631/1262	4.17	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.17	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	2	1	0	0	3	3.17	1156/1256	3.17	4.34	4.30	4.34	3.17	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	515/ 788	3.80	4.03	4.00	4.07	3.80	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 68	****	4.66	4.49	4.70	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 69	****	4.26	4.53	4.66	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 63	****	4.24	4.44	4.56	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 2			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 12	Non-major 0
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	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 10		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101  
 Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU  
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1408  
 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	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	870/1481	4.23	4.26	4.29	4.29	4.23	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	4	3	3.69	1237/1481	3.69	4.26	4.23	4.23	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	703/1249	4.31	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.31	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	684/1424	4.31	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	131/1396	4.77	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.77	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	638/1342	4.15	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.15	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	0	6	0	6	3.77	1148/1459	3.77	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	3	4.23	1230/1480	4.23	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	959/1450	3.92	4.10	4.09	4.10	3.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	1131/1409	4.08	4.46	4.42	4.43	4.08	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	636/1407	4.85	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	3	5	4	3.85	1125/1399	3.85	4.30	4.26	4.27	3.85	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	4	3.92	1074/1400	3.92	4.35	4.27	4.28	3.92	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	590/1179	4.00	3.94	3.96	4.02	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	4	1	4	3.70	913/1262	3.70	4.18	4.05	4.14	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	867/1259	4.10	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.10	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	1	0	0	5	4	4.10	860/1256	4.10	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.10	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	254/ 788	4.33	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 312 0101  
 Title INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1409  
 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	1	0	4	4	4	3.77	1248/1481	3.77	4.26	4.29	4.29	3.77	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	4	6	4.08	971/1481	4.08	4.26	4.23	4.23	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	742/1249	4.25	4.37	4.27	4.28	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	959/1424	4.00	4.27	4.21	4.27	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	6	6	4.31	459/1396	4.31	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.31	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	8	4	4.08	713/1342	4.08	4.12	4.07	4.12	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	4	5	3.85	1094/1459	3.85	4.19	4.16	4.17	3.85	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	784/1480	4.85	4.64	4.68	4.65	4.85	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	792/1450	4.08	4.10	4.09	4.10	4.08	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	4	5	3	3.69	1265/1409	3.69	4.46	4.42	4.43	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	804/1407	4.77	4.77	4.69	4.67	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	7	2	3.69	1185/1399	3.69	4.30	4.26	4.27	3.69	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	1	4	6	4.00	1017/1400	4.00	4.35	4.27	4.28	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	2	1	2	4	2	3.27	992/1179	3.27	3.94	3.96	4.02	3.27	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	0	5	2	4.00	708/1262	4.00	4.18	4.05	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	358/1259	4.75	4.40	4.29	4.34	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	496/1256	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.34	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	291/ 788	4.25	4.03	4.00	4.07	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 3	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 13 Non-major 2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 7	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 401 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN  
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S  
 Enrollment: 11  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1410  
 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	2	5	4.71	340/1481	4.71	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.71	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	264/1481	4.71	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	278/1249	4.71	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	287/1424	4.67	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	0	2	3	4.17	584/1396	4.17	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	384/1342	4.43	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.29	749/1459	4.29	4.19	4.16	4.25	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	4.74	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	473/1450	4.40	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	483/1409	4.71	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	929/1399	4.14	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	844/1400	4.29	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	152/1179	4.71	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	236/1262	4.71	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	402/1259	4.71	4.40	4.29	4.57	4.71	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	532/1256	4.57	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	159/ 788	4.57	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2		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	6
			? 1		



Course-Section: SPAN 421 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI  
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 14  
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1411  
 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	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1481	5.00	4.26	4.29	4.45	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	149/1481	4.86	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.86	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.44	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.35	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1396	5.00	4.07	3.98	4.09	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.12	4.07	4.21	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	143/1459	4.83	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1480	5.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	184/1450	4.71	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	261/1409	4.86	4.46	4.42	4.51	4.86	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	170/1399	4.86	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.86	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	198/1400	4.86	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	223/1179	4.57	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.57	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.33	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	658/1256	4.43	4.34	4.30	4.60	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	83/ 788	4.86	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 0	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 7
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: SPAN 472 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI  
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1412  
 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	12	4.92	127/1481	4.92	4.26	4.29	4.45	4.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	219/1481	4.77	4.26	4.23	4.32	4.77	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	160/1249	4.88	4.37	4.27	4.44	4.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	11	4.69	263/1424	4.69	4.27	4.21	4.35	4.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	102/1396	4.83	4.07	3.98	4.09	4.83	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	77/1342	4.92	4.12	4.07	4.21	4.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	196/1459	4.75	4.19	4.16	4.25	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	797/1480	4.83	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.83	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	99/1450	4.90	4.10	4.09	4.28	4.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.51	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	103/1399	4.92	4.30	4.26	4.36	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	208/1400	4.85	4.35	4.27	4.38	4.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	70/1179	4.92	3.94	3.96	4.07	4.92	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	126/1262	4.91	4.18	4.05	4.33	4.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1259	5.00	4.40	4.29	4.57	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1256	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.60	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	133/ 788	4.67	4.03	4.00	4.26	4.67	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 8	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 1
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General	4
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 3	D 0		Under-grad 12
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	9
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 601 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN  
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Spring 2006

Page 1413  
 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	0	4.00	1069/1481	4.00	4.26	4.29	4.28	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1000/1481	4.00	4.26	4.23	4.11	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1249	5.00	4.37	4.27	4.24	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1424	5.00	4.27	4.21	4.16	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	707/1396	4.00	4.07	3.98	4.00	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	755/1342	4.00	4.12	4.07	4.18	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1459	5.00	4.19	4.16	4.01	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1349/1480	4.00	4.64	4.68	4.74	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	836/1450	4.00	4.10	4.09	3.96	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1409	5.00	4.46	4.42	4.36	5.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1407	5.00	4.77	4.69	4.73	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1002/1399	4.00	4.30	4.26	4.16	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1400	5.00	4.35	4.27	4.17	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1179	5.00	3.94	3.96	3.81	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1262	5.00	4.18	4.05	4.07	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	895/1259	4.00	4.40	4.29	4.30	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	901/1256	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.33	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	394/ 788	4.00	4.03	4.00	3.97	4.00	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	4.66	4.49	4.23	5.00	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	58/ 69	4.00	4.26	4.53	4.46	4.00	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 63	5.00	4.24	4.44	4.44	5.00	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 68	5.00	3.98	3.92	3.71	5.00	

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	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	0				
				?	0						