

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1539  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	12	4.63	482/1639	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.63	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	393/1639	3.92	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	795/1397	4.16	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.25	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	792/1583	4.03	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	3	5	5	3.63	1168/1532	3.38	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	6	8	4.47	416/1504	3.91	4.04	4.05	3.78	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	8	6	4.25	814/1612	3.86	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.25	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	8	8	4.50	1135/1635	4.19	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	473/1579	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	807/1518	3.54	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	674/1520	4.52	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	428/1517	3.74	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.64	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	231/1550	3.91	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.86	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	1	1	2	6	4.30	421/1295	3.34	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	294/1398	3.78	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	564/1391	4.25	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	435/1388	3.85	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	201/ 958	3.69	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.50	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1539  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	4	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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: ACEVEDO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1540  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	7	4	4	3.53	1488/1639	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.53	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	6	4	3.53	1473/1639	3.92	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.53	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	3	9	4.19	859/1397	4.16	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.19	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	5	6	5	3.88	1171/1583	4.03	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.88	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	4	5	3.35	1321/1532	3.38	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.35	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	6	5	5	3.82	997/1504	3.91	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	6	4	5	3.71	1305/1612	3.86	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	13	2	4.00	1497/1635	4.19	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	1	6	5	0	3.33	1390/1579	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.33	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	7	5	0	2.94	1490/1518	3.54	4.23	4.43	4.38	2.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	1305/1520	4.52	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	4	6	3	3.35	1399/1517	3.74	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.35	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	5	3	5	4	3.47	1340/1550	3.91	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	2	1	5	3	1	3.00	1158/1295	3.34	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	1	5	1	2	3.20	1222/1398	3.78	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	4	3	3	3.90	1065/1391	4.25	4.51	4.30	4.07	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	6	0	3	3.40	1226/1388	3.85	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	3	1	2	2	0	2	3.00	841/ 958	3.69	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.00	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 17	Non-major 17
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 1	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 7		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I  
 Instructor: ACEVEDO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 29  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1541  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	2	0	0	1	5	3	9	4.11	1055/1639	4.09	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.11	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	4	4	5	5	3.61	1438/1639	3.92	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	954/1397	4.16	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.06	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	2	4	5	7	3.94	1098/1583	4.03	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.94	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	3	7	2	4	3.17	1390/1532	3.38	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	9	1	5	3.44	1240/1504	3.91	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	3	4	4	6	3.61	1354/1612	3.86	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.61	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	1	15	2	4.06	1475/1635	4.19	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	3	3	4	2	3.42	1359/1579	3.73	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.42	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	4	4	3	4	3.18	1469/1518	3.54	4.23	4.43	4.38	3.18	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	1305/1520	4.52	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.35	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	7	2	4	3.24	1427/1517	3.74	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	4	3	5	4	3.41	1364/1550	3.91	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.41	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	5	2	3	2	3	2.73	1221/1295	3.34	3.77	3.94	3.84	2.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	3	2	1	3.43	1150/1398	3.78	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	793/1391	4.25	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1217/1388	3.85	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	1	3	1	2	3.57	694/ 958	3.69	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 3	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 1	D 1		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 0	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: ACEVEDO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1542  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	1	1	6	5	3	3.50	1497/1639	3.81	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	5	4	1	6	3.50	1481/1639	3.79	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	2	3	3	2	6	3.44	1290/1397	3.78	4.37	4.28	4.18	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	5	2	5	4	3.50	1406/1583	3.76	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	3	4	5	1	3.00	1421/1532	3.41	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	1	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	1259/1504	3.57	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	1	2	5	0	3	5	3.27	1471/1612	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.27	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	1	0	0	2	13	4.63	1045/1635	4.34	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1056/1579	3.68	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.90	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	0	5	3	5	3.44	1435/1518	3.93	4.23	4.43	4.38	3.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	3	1	2	9	4.13	1390/1520	4.38	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.13	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	3	3	5	3	3.25	1424/1517	3.77	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	1	2	3	2	3	5	3.40	1368/1550	3.95	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	1	4	4	3	0	2.75	1219/1295	3.49	3.77	3.94	3.84	2.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	5	0	5	3.67	1030/1398	3.85	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	983/1391	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	5	1	5	3.83	1065/1388	4.20	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	0	1	2	5	2	3.80	577/ 958	3.83	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.80	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 0	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	1	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 4	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0201  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA  
 Enrollment: 28  
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1543  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	2	0	3	9	5	3.79	1339/1639	3.81	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	3	7	8	4.16	959/1639	3.79	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.16	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	10	6	4.11	935/1397	3.78	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.11	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	12	5	4.16	891/1583	3.76	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.16	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	0	2	5	6	3.87	942/1532	3.41	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	2	7	6	3.83	990/1504	3.57	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	790/1612	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.10	4.28	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1635	4.34	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	612/1579	3.68	4.00	4.08	3.95	4.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	4	3	11	4.26	1085/1518	3.93	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.26	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	925/1520	4.38	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	5	3	10	4.16	982/1517	3.77	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.16	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	1	5	11	4.32	850/1550	3.95	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.32	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	459/1295	3.49	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	599/1398	3.85	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.29	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	616/1391	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	721/1388	4.20	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	1	9	2	3.85	558/ 958	3.83	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.85	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 6	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		
56-83	4	2.00-2.99 2	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 20 Non-major 20
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 3	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 6	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1544  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	7	4	3.88	1274/1639	3.81	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	5	4	3.69	1399/1639	3.79	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	8	2	6	3.88	1105/1397	3.78	4.37	4.28	4.18	3.88	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	6	1	6	3.79	1240/1583	3.76	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	2	3	4	3	3.67	1136/1532	3.41	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	2	1	7	2	3.54	1194/1504	3.57	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.54	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	6	4	3.75	1279/1612	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	2	4.06	1471/1635	4.34	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.06	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	3	8	0	3.58	1279/1579	3.68	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.58	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	1077/1518	3.93	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1264/1520	4.38	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.42	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	3	6	2	3.91	1182/1517	3.77	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.91	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	1	3	6	4.27	882/1550	3.95	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.27	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	1	1	3	1	3.67	894/1295	3.49	3.77	3.94	3.84	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	887/1398	3.85	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.91	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	983/1391	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	920/1388	4.20	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	2	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	658/ 958	3.83	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.67	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	4.54	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.67	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	4.69	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	4.67	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1544  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	7	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						



Course-Section: SPAN 102 0501  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARY  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1545  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	2	4	3	9	4.06	1103/1639	3.81	4.22	4.27	4.08	4.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	7	4	3.56	1462/1639	3.79	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.56	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	2	5	6	4	3.56	1258/1397	3.78	4.37	4.28	4.18	3.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	3	3	8	4	3.72	1282/1583	3.76	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.72	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	5	6	3	3.47	1258/1532	3.41	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.47	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	4	6	5	3.76	1042/1504	3.57	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	4	7	5	3.74	1289/1612	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.74	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	397/1635	4.34	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.94	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	2	1	3	7	2	3.40	1364/1579	3.68	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	1	2	7	5	3.71	1385/1518	3.93	4.23	4.43	4.38	3.71	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	1129/1520	4.38	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.59	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	2	6	5	3.65	1298/1517	3.77	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.65	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	3	8	3.94	1127/1550	3.95	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.94	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	569/1295	3.49	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.11	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	728/1398	3.85	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.11	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	816/1391	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.07	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	758/1388	4.20	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.38	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	456/ 958	3.83	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 7	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 4	General 1	Under-grad 19 Non-major 19
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 3	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 1	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARY  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1546  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	5	3	3.92	1240/1639	3.81	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	1090/1639	3.79	4.15	4.22	4.17	4.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	973/1397	3.78	4.37	4.28	4.18	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	7	3	4.18	862/1583	3.76	4.18	4.19	4.01	4.18	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	2	5	1	3.27	1353/1532	3.41	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	3.92	932/1504	3.57	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	7	2	3.83	1229/1612	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	4.34	4.38	4.65	4.56	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	3	1	3.71	1200/1579	3.68	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	5	3	1	3.56	1411/1518	3.93	4.23	4.43	4.38	3.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1367/1520	4.38	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.22	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1199/1517	3.77	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.88	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	2	4.13	1010/1550	3.95	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.13	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	346/1295	3.49	3.77	3.94	3.84	4.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	625/1398	3.85	4.18	4.07	3.85	4.25	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.07	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	387/1388	4.20	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	349/ 958	3.83	4.02	3.93	3.71	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0701  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 26  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1547  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	5	4	3.73	1371/1639	3.81	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	1227/1639	3.79	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.93	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	1151/1397	3.78	4.37	4.28	4.18	3.80	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	5	3	3.50	1406/1583	3.76	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	3	3	3	2	3.00	1421/1532	3.41	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	1	5	4	1	2.80	1445/1504	3.57	4.04	4.05	3.78	2.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	4	2	6	3.67	1327/1612	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.67	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	12	0	3.86	1576/1635	4.34	4.38	4.65	4.56	3.86	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	4	8	0	3.46	1336/1579	3.68	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.46	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	10	4.40	947/1518	3.93	4.23	4.43	4.38	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	12	4.67	1033/1520	4.38	4.67	4.70	4.61	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	4	7	4.00	1083/1517	3.77	4.15	4.27	4.20	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	2	8	4.07	1048/1550	3.95	4.27	4.22	4.17	4.07	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	4	1	1	1	2	2.56	1242/1295	3.49	3.77	3.94	3.84	2.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	2	0	1	5	2	3.50	1106/1398	3.85	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	1	0	1	5	3	3.90	1065/1391	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.07	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	802/1388	4.20	4.35	4.28	4.01	4.30	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	1	0	1	2	3	3.86	554/ 958	3.83	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.86	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	10
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	1
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801  
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1548  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	4	3.79	1339/1639	3.81	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.79	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	3	4	3.69	1393/1639	3.79	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.69	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	1	6	4	3.71	1195/1397	3.78	4.37	4.28	4.18	3.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	3	2	4	3.50	1406/1583	3.76	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	1	3	4	3	3.58	1195/1532	3.41	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.58	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	5	4	3.71	1083/1504	3.57	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	1299/1612	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	2	10	2	0	3.00	1618/1635	4.34	4.38	4.65	4.56	3.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	6	6	0	3.38	1371/1579	3.68	4.00	4.08	3.95	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	2	5	4	3.85	1337/1518	3.93	4.23	4.43	4.38	3.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	5	4	4	3.92	1438/1520	4.38	4.67	4.70	4.61	3.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	2	5	3	3	3.54	1335/1517	3.77	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.54	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	2	5	3	3.54	1318/1550	3.95	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.54	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	3	1	3	2	1	2.70	1225/1295	3.49	3.77	3.94	3.84	2.70	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1222/1398	3.85	4.18	4.07	3.85	3.20	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	1065/1391	4.22	4.51	4.30	4.07	3.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	2	0	2	2	4	3.60	1157/1388	4.20	4.35	4.28	4.01	3.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	2	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	776/ 958	3.83	4.02	3.93	3.71	3.38	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 14
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	1
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0101  
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH  
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1549  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	3	3	4	0	2.50	1630/1639	2.97	4.22	4.27	4.08	2.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	4	4	3	1	2.79	1612/1639	3.02	4.15	4.22	4.17	2.79	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	4	2	5	1	2.93	1375/1397	3.18	4.37	4.28	4.18	2.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	4	4	2	3.14	1510/1583	3.48	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.14	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	3	1	3	1	2.80	1471/1532	3.08	4.10	4.01	3.88	2.80	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	5	5	0	3.00	1415/1504	3.07	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	2	2	2	3	4	3.38	1445/1612	3.63	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.38	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.07	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	3	1	4	2	0	2.50	1555/1579	2.68	4.00	4.08	3.95	2.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	3	5	1	3	0	2.33	1507/1518	2.97	4.23	4.43	4.38	2.33	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	2	3	2	3	3.17	1510/1520	3.45	4.67	4.70	4.61	3.17	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	5	3	0	3	1	2.33	1506/1517	2.67	4.15	4.27	4.20	2.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	6	2	1	1	2	2.25	1510/1550	2.86	4.27	4.22	4.17	2.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	3	2	1	0	0	1.67	1288/1295	2.24	3.77	3.94	3.84	1.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	****/1398	****	4.18	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	****/1391	****	4.51	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/1388	****	4.35	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	3.71	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	3.90	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.01	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.25	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.12	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.25	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.39	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	3.90	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	3.61	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	3.51	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.79	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	5.00	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.60	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough			

P	3			responses to be significant
I	0	Other	2	
?	1			

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201  
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH  
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1550  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	6	6	2	3.44	1520/1639	2.97	4.22	4.27	4.08	3.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	5	3	3	4	3.25	1553/1639	3.02	4.15	4.22	4.17	3.25	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	5	4	3.44	1290/1397	3.18	4.37	4.28	4.18	3.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	4	5	5	3.81	1219/1583	3.48	4.18	4.19	4.01	3.81	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	4	2	3	4	3.36	1321/1532	3.08	4.10	4.01	3.88	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	4	2	4	3	3.13	1381/1504	3.07	4.04	4.05	3.78	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	2	4	6	3.87	1206/1612	3.63	4.02	4.16	4.10	3.87	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1434/1635	4.07	4.38	4.65	4.56	4.13	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	5	5	3	1	2.87	1517/1579	2.68	4.00	4.08	3.95	2.87	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	1	6	2	5	3.60	1404/1518	2.97	4.23	4.43	4.38	3.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	2	1	3	2	7	3.73	1468/1520	3.45	4.67	4.70	4.61	3.73	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	3	4	2	3.00	1453/1517	2.67	4.15	4.27	4.20	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	3	4	4	3.47	1344/1550	2.86	4.27	4.22	4.17	3.47	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	4	2	0	2	3	2.82	1211/1295	2.24	3.77	3.94	3.84	2.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	****/1398	****	4.18	4.07	3.85	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1391	****	4.51	4.30	4.07	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1388	****	4.35	4.28	4.01	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	****/ 958	****	4.02	3.93	3.71	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	10
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1
			P 1		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	2
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1551  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	8	10	4.56	561/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.56	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	886/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	603/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	697/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	3	6	6	3.94	856/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.94	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	441/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	8	5	5	3.83	1229/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	1135/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	473/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.43	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	1118/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.22	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	725/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.83	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	917/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.22	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	457/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	3	6	4	3.73	851/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	426/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	462/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.70	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	224/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	155/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.67	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	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				
				?	0						



Course-Section: SPAN 201 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1552  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	2	8	4.15	1003/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.15	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1036/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	9	4.54	487/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.54	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	2	7	4.23	812/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.23	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	2	1	4	3.40	1300/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.40	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	3	2	1	7	3.92	920/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	1	2	6	3.83	1229/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	1225/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.42	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	818/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	4	4.17	1162/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.17	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	890/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.75	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	886/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	545/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	978/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	****	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1552  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	1	B	3						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	12
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	2	D	1						
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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0301  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: RICHARDS, F  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1553  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	3	2	5	3.54	1484/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.54	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	2	4	2	4	3.46	1497/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.46	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	0	6	4	3.69	1204/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	3.69	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	3.62	1359/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	2	1	2	5	1	3.18	1384/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	4	5	2	3.38	1271/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.38	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	1	3	5	3.46	1415/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.46	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	2	4.15	1422/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.15	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	3	3	3	2	3.36	1379/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.36	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	1	5	1	3.30	1453/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.30	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	1230/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.45	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	0	5	2	3.36	1396/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	3.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	3	4	3.90	1161/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	3.90	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	2	3	3	1	3.33	1067/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.33	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1252/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	3.13	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	816/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.25	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	1	4	2	3.88	1047/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	3.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	1	3	3	3.88	544/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	3.88	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	

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	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0401  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: RICHARDS, F  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1554  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	5	7	2	3.35	1541/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.35	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	4	6	3	4	3.41	1517/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.41	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	6	4	3.65	1228/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	2	0	5	5	4	3.56	1382/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	2	0	5	5	2	3.36	1321/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.36	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	8	4	1	3.06	1401/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1305/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	16	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	4	3	4	1	3.00	1477/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	2	4	5	2	3.06	1478/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.06	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	1363/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	3	6	4	4	3.53	1339/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	3.53	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	3	4	5	3.35	1380/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	3.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	3	2	3	0	3	2.82	1211/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	2.82	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	4	0	5	1	2	2.75	1330/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	2.75	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	686/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.42	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	944/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	2	1	2	3	3	3.36	779/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	3.36	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
Seminar															
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	7	D	2						
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	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0501  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI  
 Enrollment: 17  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1555  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	4	6	3.88	1274/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	1210/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	950/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.07	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	4	4	6	4.00	1010/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	1	3	4	2	3	3.23	1367/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.23	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	5	5	3.87	971/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.87	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	955/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	15	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	657/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.25	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	1216/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	1166/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	2	9	3	3.87	1205/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	3.87	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	769/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	2	6	2	1	3.18	1127/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.18	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	582/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	616/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	571/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.60	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	430/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.11	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	2	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 3	General 0	Under-grad 16 Non-major 16
84-150	7	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 201 0601  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1556  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	0	9	4	3.93	1217/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.93	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	2	6	5	3.87	1287/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	6	5	3.93	1052/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	3.93	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	8	5	4.07	967/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.07	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	3.18	1384/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1083/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	4	3	5	3.71	1299/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	9	5	4.36	1273/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.36	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	1	1	2	0	4	3	3.60	1270/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	7	4	4.07	1213/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.07	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	1222/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.46	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	2	0	0	7	3	3.75	1260/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	3.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	0	1	5	5	3.85	1193/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	3.85	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	481/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.22	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	929/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	3.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	328/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	1	0	0	1	3	4.00	456/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0701  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1557  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	8	2	2	3.06	1595/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.06	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	4	4	2	3.00	1579/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	5	5	2	5	3.41	1296/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	3.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	5	5	3.59	1374/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	4	3	4	3.12	1405/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.12	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	1129/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.65	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	1	3	9	3.82	1237/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.82	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	2	4.12	1447/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	5	9	2	0	2.81	1523/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	2.81	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	2	6	3	2	3.21	1464/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.21	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	2	3	8	4.29	1345/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.29	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	4	4	3	2	3.07	1449/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	3.07	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	5	3	2	2	2.79	1474/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	2.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	3	2	4	1	1	2.55	1243/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	2.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1002/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	3.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	332/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	0	3	1	5	3.90	1035/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	3.90	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	380/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.20	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0701  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1557  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	2	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	8	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	7	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	6				
				?	2						



Course-Section: SPAN 201 0801  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU  
 Enrollment: 24  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1558  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	257/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.80	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	156/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.87	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	11	4.53	487/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	524/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.47	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	0	3	1	6	3.54	1223/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.54	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	367/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	79/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.93	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	125/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.85	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	170/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	125/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	305/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.45	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	135/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.71	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	8
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 15
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1559  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	3	7	5	3.82	1311/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.82	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	6	3.94	1193/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	5	5	5	3.65	1228/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	3.65	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	4	5	6	3.82	1212/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	3.82	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	2	4	2	4	3.13	1399/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.13	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	5	5	3.71	1092/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.71	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	965/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.12	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	691/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	1	0	5	4	4.20	725/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	2	3	9	4.27	1085/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.27	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.79	837/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.79	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	779/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	556/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	1	0	5	5	3	3.64	905/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	5	3	6	4.07	745/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	4	2	8	4.29	793/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.29	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	721/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.43	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	3	0	2	2	6	1	3.55	707/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	3.55	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 22  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1559  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	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	3				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1560  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	4	9	4.57	540/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	323/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	339/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	2	6	3.85	957/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.85	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	3	7	4.21	647/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	139/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.86	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	332/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	170/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	125/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	3	1	0	2	2	6	4.09	581/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.09	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	403/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	224/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	119/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.75	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1561  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	5	6	3.88	1274/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.88	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	926/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.19	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	11	4.50	517/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	476/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	1	4	7	3.87	942/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.87	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	0	3	4	6	3.80	1010/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.80	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	1044/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	352/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	1	4	8	4.36	1000/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	699/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	1083/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	0	5	7	4.38	787/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	4	0	2	1	3	3	3.78	825/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.78	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	0	1	1	7	4.30	582/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.30	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	647/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	411/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1562  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	4	8	4.43	726/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.43	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	273/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.73	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	0	11	4.47	574/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	597/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	4	4	4	4.00	774/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	647/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	388/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	241/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	863/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.46	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	437/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	779/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	742/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	0	3	2	1	2	3.25	1101/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	5	3	4.10	735/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.10	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	332/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	740/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.40	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	540/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	3.89	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.43	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	4.33	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	1.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	3.00	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1562  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	3	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	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	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1301  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO  
 Enrollment: 20  
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1563  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	7	5	4.21	929/1639	4.01	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.21	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	5	4.14	970/1639	4.07	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	5	4.14	897/1397	4.13	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.14	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	625/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.38	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	6	2	3.75	1046/1532	3.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	0	8	3	4.08	780/1504	3.89	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.08	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	934/1612	4.09	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.14	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	529/1635	4.57	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.93	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	496/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	807/1518	4.12	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	546/1520	4.69	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.90	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	6	4	4.40	726/1517	4.08	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.40	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	522/1550	4.27	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	0	2	1	0	4	1	3.13	1143/1295	3.51	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.13	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	560/1398	4.04	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	616/1391	4.68	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	647/1388	4.48	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	119/ 958	4.17	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.75	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0 Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 1	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 14 Non-major 13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	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 3	
			? 0		



Course-Section: SPAN 201H 0101  
 Title INTERM SPAN I - HONORS  
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU  
 Enrollment: 5  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1564  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	951/1639	4.20	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.20	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	415/1639	4.60	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	850/1397	4.20	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	852/1583	4.20	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.20	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	2.60	1491/1532	2.60	4.10	4.01	4.09	2.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	824/1504	4.00	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	882/1612	4.20	4.02	4.16	4.21	4.20	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	496/1579	4.40	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	684/1518	4.60	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.60	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	802/1520	4.80	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	239/1517	4.80	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	769/1550	4.40	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	1293/1295	1.00	3.77	3.94	4.07	1.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	983/1391	4.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	944/1388	4.00	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	725/ 958	3.50	4.02	3.93	4.00	3.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1565  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	2	13	4.69	404/1639	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.69	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	800/1639	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.27	4.31	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	15	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/1397	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.39	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	11	5	4.31	726/1583	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.31	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	7	4.19	640/1532	4.06	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.19	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	11	4.69	230/1504	4.31	4.04	4.05	4.09	4.69	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	4	7	3.94	1135/1612	3.85	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.94	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1635	4.79	4.38	4.65	4.63	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	13	1	4.00	889/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	454/1518	4.07	4.23	4.43	4.48	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	622/1520	4.94	4.67	4.70	4.78	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	886/1517	3.81	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.25	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	14	4.75	351/1550	4.15	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.75	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	413/1295	3.97	3.77	3.94	4.07	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	309/1398	4.55	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	2	2	9	4.54	594/1391	4.77	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.54	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	375/1388	4.88	4.35	4.28	4.37	4.77	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	359/ 958	4.32	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.23	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.33	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.61	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.08	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.00	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	3.00	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	****	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	2.00	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.00	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.28	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	****	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	****	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	****	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	3.24	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	****	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA  
 Enrollment: 23  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1565  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	9	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0201  
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1566  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	3	5	6	4.00	1138/1639	4.34	4.22	4.27	4.35	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	5	4	4	3.67	1410/1639	3.99	4.15	4.22	4.27	3.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	487/1397	4.53	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.53	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	597/1583	4.36	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	1	5	5	3.92	883/1532	4.06	4.10	4.01	4.09	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	6	5	3.93	920/1504	4.31	4.04	4.05	4.09	3.93	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	0	1	3	7	2	3.77	1273/1612	3.85	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.77	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	1	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	1080/1635	4.79	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	818/1579	4.06	4.00	4.08	4.14	4.11	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	4	4	1	3.40	1442/1518	4.07	4.23	4.43	4.48	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1520	4.94	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	1	1	4	3	2	3.36	1396/1517	3.81	4.15	4.27	4.34	3.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	2	2	2	4	3.55	1315/1550	4.15	4.27	4.22	4.33	3.55	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	0	1	1	2	4	3	3.64	911/1295	3.97	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.64	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	511/1398	4.55	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1391	4.77	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	4.88	4.35	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	267/ 958	4.32	4.02	3.93	4.00	4.40	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 4	Required for Majors	3
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 5		Graduate 0
56-83	0	2.00-2.99 0	C 4	General	4
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		Under-grad 16
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 2	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	7
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 202H 0201  
 Title INTERMED SPAN II HONR  
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI  
 Enrollment: 4  
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1567  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	2	0	3.25	1565/1639	3.25	4.22	4.27	4.35	3.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	2.50	1628/1639	2.50	4.15	4.22	4.27	2.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4.00	973/1397	4.00	4.37	4.28	4.39	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	239/1583	4.75	4.18	4.19	4.28	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.10	4.01	4.09	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.04	4.05	4.09	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1279/1612	3.75	4.02	4.16	4.21	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	884/1635	4.75	4.38	4.65	4.63	4.75	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1232/1579	3.67	4.00	4.08	4.14	3.67	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1499/1518	2.75	4.23	4.43	4.48	2.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.78	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2.75	1488/1517	2.75	4.15	4.27	4.34	2.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	1077/1550	4.00	4.27	4.22	4.33	4.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	838/1295	3.75	3.77	3.94	4.07	3.75	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.18	4.07	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.37	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.02	3.93	4.00	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1568  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	3	5	4.44	698/1639	3.89	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	517/1639	3.77	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	261/1397	4.05	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.78	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	822/1583	3.82	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	178/1532	4.14	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	122/1504	3.78	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	218/1612	3.45	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	1045/1635	4.22	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	205/1579	3.99	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	416/1518	3.85	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.78	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	1033/1520	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	275/1517	4.02	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	457/1550	4.02	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	623/1295	3.30	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	560/1398	4.28	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	927/1391	4.59	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.11	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	363/1388	4.70	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	3	1	5	4.22	364/ 958	4.16	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.06	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.44	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 215	****	****	4.35	4.21	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 198	****	****	4.18	4.04	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.58	4.50	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	4.60	4.52	4.59	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 78	****	4.80	4.47	4.60	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	4.20	4.47	4.65	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 82	****	3.00	4.16	4.08	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	****	4.04	4.78	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	****	4.05	4.31	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 42	****	****	4.75	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 37	****	****	4.58	4.52	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.56	4.30	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 50	****	4.33	4.45	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	4.33	4.51	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 43	****	****	4.69	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 32	****	****	4.37	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	9	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	****	4.52	5.00	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1568  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	1	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	3	Under-grad	9	Non-major	8
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0201  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1569  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	2	2	1	2.67	1625/1639	3.89	4.22	4.27	4.28	2.67	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	2	0	2.67	1618/1639	3.77	4.15	4.22	4.20	2.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	1	4	1	3.38	1308/1397	4.05	4.37	4.28	4.26	3.38	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	3	1	2	3.25	1484/1583	3.82	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.25	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	4	0	3.25	1360/1532	4.14	4.10	4.01	4.05	3.25	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	4	0	2.89	1437/1504	3.78	4.04	4.05	4.12	2.89	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	1	2	2	3	0	2.88	1551/1612	3.45	4.02	4.16	4.12	2.88	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	1	5	2	3.89	1572/1635	4.22	4.38	4.65	4.66	3.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1458/1579	3.99	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.13	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	1	3	2	0	2.63	1503/1518	3.85	4.23	4.43	4.39	2.63	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	1087/1520	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	2	1	3.13	1445/1517	4.02	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	2	3	1	3.25	1402/1550	4.02	4.27	4.22	4.20	3.25	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	2	0	1	2	0	2.60	1237/1295	3.30	3.77	3.94	3.95	2.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1106/1398	4.28	4.18	4.07	4.13	3.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	489/1391	4.59	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	296/1388	4.70	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	456/ 958	4.16	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.00	

Frequency Distribution

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



Course-Section: SPAN 301 0301  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I  
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1570  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	540/1639	3.89	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	970/1639	3.77	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.14	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	973/1397	4.05	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1010/1583	3.82	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	419/1532	4.14	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	2	3.57	1171/1504	3.78	4.04	4.05	4.12	3.57	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	3	0	1	2.71	1569/1612	3.45	4.02	4.16	4.12	2.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1428/1635	4.22	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.14	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	783/1579	3.99	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.14	
-----															
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	4.14	1175/1518	3.85	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.14	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1520	4.76	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	3	3	4.14	990/1517	4.02	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.14	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	991/1550	4.02	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.14	
-----															
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1398	4.28	4.18	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1391	4.59	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	647/1388	4.70	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	349/ 958	4.16	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1571  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	4.18	964/1639	3.89	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	4	3.91	1262/1639	3.70	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.91	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	1	7	4.27	776/1397	3.74	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.27	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	4.09	946/1583	3.75	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.09	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	562/1532	3.64	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.27	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	678/1504	3.39	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.18	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	4	2	3	3.36	1449/1612	2.88	4.02	4.16	4.12	3.36	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	9	1	4.00	1497/1635	4.50	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	783/1579	3.47	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	4	3	3.82	1347/1518	3.51	4.23	4.43	4.39	3.82	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	1158/1520	4.17	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.55	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	5	2	3	3.80	1241/1517	3.40	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	953/1550	3.29	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.18	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	0	1	0	1	3	4.20	505/1295	3.10	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	1	0	1	5	4.43	494/1398	3.88	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.43	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	678/1391	3.55	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	593/1388	3.45	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	185/ 958	3.12	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.57	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 11
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 1	Other	9
			? 0		

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II  
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S  
 Enrollment: 8  
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1572  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	3	0	3.60	1454/1639	3.89	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.60	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	1481/1639	3.70	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1337/1397	3.74	4.37	4.28	4.26	3.20	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	3.40	1449/1583	3.75	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.40	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1421/1532	3.64	4.10	4.01	4.05	3.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	2.60	1474/1504	3.39	4.04	4.05	4.12	2.60	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	2.40	1582/1612	2.88	4.02	4.16	4.12	2.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1635	4.50	4.38	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2.80	1525/1579	3.47	4.00	4.08	4.07	2.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	3.20	1466/1518	3.51	4.23	4.43	4.39	3.20	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1457/1520	4.17	4.67	4.70	4.68	3.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	1453/1517	3.40	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	2.40	1500/1550	3.29	4.27	4.22	4.20	2.40	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1273/1295	3.10	3.77	3.94	3.95	2.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1183/1398	3.88	4.18	4.07	4.13	3.33	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	2.67	1370/1391	3.55	4.51	4.30	4.35	2.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	0	2	0	0	2.33	1378/1388	3.45	4.35	4.28	4.34	2.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	2	0	1	0	0	1.67	944/ 958	3.12	4.02	3.93	3.97	1.67	

Frequency Distribution

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

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302H 0101  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II  
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1573  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies					Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect		
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean		
-----														
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1639	3.50	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1090/1639	3.75	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	3.75	4.18	4.19	4.24	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	774/1532	3.75	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	824/1504	3.25	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1044/1612	3.50	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1497/1635	4.50	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1579	3.50	4.00	4.08	4.07	5.00
-----														
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	3.50	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	4.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1083/1517	3.50	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	3.50	4.27	4.22	4.20	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	3.75	3.77	3.94	3.95	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302H 0201  
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II  
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S  
 Enrollment: 2  
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1574  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	0	1	3.00	1599/1639	3.50	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1481/1639	3.75	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1268/1397	3.50	4.37	4.28	4.26	3.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1575/1583	3.75	4.18	4.19	4.24	2.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	1241/1532	3.75	4.10	4.01	4.05	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1477/1504	3.25	4.04	4.05	4.12	2.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1519/1612	3.50	4.02	4.16	4.12	3.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1635	4.50	4.38	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1574/1579	3.50	4.00	4.08	4.07	2.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1481/1518	3.50	4.23	4.43	4.39	3.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1512/1520	4.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	3.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1453/1517	3.50	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1518/1550	3.50	4.27	4.22	4.20	2.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1247/1295	3.75	3.77	3.94	3.95	2.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1384/1398	2.00	4.18	4.07	4.13	2.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	616/1391	4.50	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1383/1388	2.00	4.35	4.28	4.34	2.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	841/ 958	3.00	4.02	3.93	3.97	3.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101  
 Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS  
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1575  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	11	4.85	222/1639	4.85	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	102/1639	4.92	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.92	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	168/1583	4.85	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.85	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	84/1532	4.92	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	134/1504	4.85	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	90/1612	4.92	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.92	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1311/1635	4.31	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	137/1579	4.80	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.80	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	301/1518	4.85	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.85	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	125/1517	4.92	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.92	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.27	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	1	0	2	8	4.55	247/1295	4.55	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	161/1398	4.90	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.90	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	227/1391	4.90	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.90	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	75/ 958	4.90	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.90	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307H 0101  
 Title ESPANA Y SUS CULT-HONO  
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT  
 Enrollment: 1  
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1576  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.22	4.27	4.28	5.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1639	5.00	4.15	4.22	4.20	5.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1397	5.00	4.37	4.28	4.26	5.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1583	5.00	4.18	4.19	4.24	5.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1532	5.00	4.10	4.01	4.05	5.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.04	4.05	4.12	5.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1612	5.00	4.02	4.16	4.12	5.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.66	5.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1237/1518	4.00	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.67	4.70	4.68	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1517	5.00	4.15	4.27	4.23	5.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1550	5.00	4.27	4.22	4.20	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1295	5.00	3.77	3.94	3.95	5.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1398	5.00	4.18	4.07	4.13	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.35	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 958	5.00	4.02	3.93	3.97	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101  
 Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU  
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA  
 Enrollment: 18  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1577  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	7	2	6	3.65	1428/1639	3.65	4.22	4.27	4.28	3.65	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	2	6	3	4	3.29	1544/1639	3.29	4.15	4.22	4.20	3.29	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	5	4	6	3.94	1052/1397	3.94	4.37	4.28	4.26	3.94	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	1	1	0	6	2	5	3.71	1289/1583	3.71	4.18	4.19	4.24	3.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	648/1532	4.18	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.18	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	8	5	4	3.76	1042/1504	3.76	4.04	4.05	4.12	3.76	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	6	4	3	3.29	1463/1612	3.29	4.02	4.16	4.12	3.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	1	6	7	2	3.63	1598/1635	3.63	4.38	4.65	4.66	3.63	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	0	7	3	0	2.92	1509/1579	2.92	4.00	4.08	4.07	2.92	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	2	0	6	2	4	3.43	1437/1518	3.43	4.23	4.43	4.39	3.43	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	3	9	4.36	1305/1520	4.36	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.36	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	2	4	2	4	3.29	1418/1517	3.29	4.15	4.27	4.23	3.29	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	2	1	5	1	5	3.43	1360/1550	3.43	4.27	4.22	4.20	3.43	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	5	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	436/1295	4.29	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.29	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	3	5	4.00	770/1398	4.00	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	557/1391	4.58	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	834/1388	4.25	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	339/ 958	4.27	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.27	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 13	Required for Majors 1	Graduate 0 Major 6
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 17 Non-major 11
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 11	
			? 1		



Course-Section: SPAN 311 0101  
 Title INTRO TO SPANISH LIT  
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1578  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	0	2	6	4.44	698/1639	4.44	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	886/1639	4.22	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	467/1397	4.56	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.56	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	423/1583	4.56	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	236/1532	4.67	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	7	4.44	441/1504	4.44	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	1	1	5	4.00	1044/1612	4.00	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	691/1635	4.89	4.38	4.65	4.66	4.89	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	783/1579	4.14	4.00	4.08	4.07	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	602/1518	4.67	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.67	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	597/1520	4.89	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	405/1517	4.67	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	1	6	4.11	1019/1550	4.11	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.11	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	2	1	0	2	4	3.56	953/1295	3.56	3.77	3.94	3.95	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	332/1391	4.80	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.34	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	179/ 958	4.60	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 312 0101  
 Title INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI  
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S  
 Enrollment: 13  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1579  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
-----															
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	318/1639	4.75	4.22	4.27	4.28	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	517/1639	4.50	4.15	4.22	4.20	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	417/1397	4.60	4.37	4.28	4.26	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	270/1583	4.73	4.18	4.19	4.24	4.73	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	105/1532	4.90	4.10	4.01	4.05	4.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	146/1504	4.82	4.04	4.05	4.12	4.82	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	561/1612	4.45	4.02	4.16	4.12	4.45	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.66	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	7	1	3.60	1270/1579	3.60	4.00	4.08	4.07	3.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	757/1518	4.55	4.23	4.43	4.39	4.55	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	546/1520	4.91	4.67	4.70	4.68	4.91	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	768/1517	4.36	4.15	4.27	4.23	4.36	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	388/1550	4.73	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	505/1295	4.20	3.77	3.94	3.95	4.20	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	294/1398	4.71	4.18	4.07	4.13	4.71	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	279/1391	4.86	4.51	4.30	4.35	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	593/1388	4.57	4.35	4.28	4.34	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	411/ 958	4.14	4.02	3.93	3.97	4.14	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 401 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN  
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA  
 Enrollment: 21  
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1580  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	5	8	4.18	977/1639	4.18	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	4	3.94	1193/1639	3.94	4.15	4.22	4.29	3.94	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	13	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	****/1397	****	4.37	4.28	4.38	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	2	3	5	5	3.69	1310/1583	3.69	4.18	4.19	4.31	3.69	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1346/1532	3.29	4.10	4.01	4.07	3.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	747/1504	4.13	4.04	4.05	4.20	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	3	4	4	4	3.60	1360/1612	3.60	4.02	4.16	4.18	3.60	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	15	5.00	1/1635	5.00	4.38	4.65	4.72	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	783/1579	4.14	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.14	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	382/1520	4.94	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1007/1517	4.13	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.13	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	9	5	4.06	1048/1550	4.06	4.27	4.22	4.24	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	0	1	1	3	2	3.86	768/1295	3.86	3.77	3.94	4.01	3.86	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	426/1398	4.50	4.18	4.07	4.23	4.50	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	0	0	11	4.75	393/1391	4.75	4.51	4.30	4.48	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	647/1388	4.50	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	6	4	4.27	339/ 958	4.27	4.02	3.93	4.24	4.27	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 224	****	4.00	4.10	4.49	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	4.75	4.11	4.26	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 219	****	****	4.44	4.42	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	9
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	13				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 421 0101  
 Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI  
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI  
 Enrollment: 19  
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1581  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	9	7	4.28	870/1639	4.28	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.28	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	7	4.22	886/1639	4.22	4.15	4.22	4.29	4.22	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	603/1397	4.44	4.37	4.28	4.38	4.44	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	929/1583	4.12	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.12	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	335/1532	4.50	4.10	4.01	4.07	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	576/1504	4.29	4.04	4.05	4.20	4.29	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	8	7	4.17	913/1612	4.17	4.02	4.16	4.18	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	1023/1635	4.65	4.38	4.65	4.72	4.65	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	6	5	4.07	853/1579	4.07	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	7	9	4.39	968/1518	4.39	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.39	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	597/1520	4.89	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.89	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1083/1517	4.00	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	6	7	4.06	1053/1550	4.06	4.27	4.22	4.24	4.06	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	4	6	5	3.94	698/1295	3.94	3.77	3.94	4.01	3.94	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	745/1398	4.07	4.18	4.07	4.23	4.07	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	678/1391	4.43	4.51	4.30	4.48	4.43	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	593/1388	4.57	4.35	4.28	4.50	4.57	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	3	4	6	4.07	442/ 958	4.07	4.02	3.93	4.24	4.07	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 11	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 5		Graduate 4
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	2
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	D 0		15
Grad.	4	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			I 0	Other	16
			? 0		

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101  
 Title TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI  
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST  
 Enrollment: 15  
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland  
 Baltimore County  
 Fall 2007

Page 1582  
 FEB 13, 2008  
 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	10	4.83	231/1639	4.83	4.22	4.27	4.42	4.83	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	349/1639	4.67	4.15	4.22	4.29	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	209/1397	4.83	4.37	4.28	4.38	4.83	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	128/1583	4.92	4.18	4.19	4.31	4.92	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	236/1532	4.67	4.10	4.01	4.07	4.67	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	367/1504	4.50	4.04	4.05	4.20	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	718/1612	4.33	4.02	4.16	4.18	4.33	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	4.08	1462/1635	4.08	4.38	4.65	4.72	4.08	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	6	5	4.45	439/1579	4.45	4.00	4.08	4.21	4.45	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	454/1518	4.75	4.23	4.43	4.51	4.75	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	491/1520	4.92	4.67	4.70	4.75	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	299/1517	4.75	4.15	4.27	4.34	4.75	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	253/1550	4.83	4.27	4.22	4.24	4.83	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	229/1295	4.58	3.77	3.94	4.01	4.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	217/1398	4.80	4.18	4.07	4.23	4.80	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1391	5.00	4.51	4.30	4.48	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1388	5.00	4.35	4.28	4.50	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	240/ 958	4.44	4.02	3.93	4.24	4.44	

Frequency Distribution

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