

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sept
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	787/1576	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.40	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	476/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.61	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	480/1342	4.59	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.60	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	376/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.63	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	537/1465	4.31	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.38	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	777/1434	4.20	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	457/1547	4.36	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.56	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	6	4.24	1339/1574	4.45	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	597/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.35	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	774/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.58	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	501/1493	4.82	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.92	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	422/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	18	4.58	602/1489	4.58	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.58	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	429/1277	4.16	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.38	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	589/1279	4.52	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.35	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	523/1270	4.68	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.65	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	632/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.53	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	2	1	6	7	4.13	435/ 878	4.43	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.13	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	53/ 326	4.96	4.99	4.03	3.64	4.96	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 10	Required for Majors 16
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 5	Graduate 0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C 1	Under-grad 25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0	Non-major 25
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0	
				P 1	

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

I	0	Other	3
?	2		

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: KING, ROBIN R
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1487
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	541/1576	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	462/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.62	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	345/1342	4.59	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	385/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.62	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	668/1465	4.31	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.24	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	594/1434	4.20	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	575/1547	4.36	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.48	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.45	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	331/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.59	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	484/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.76	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	683/1493	4.82	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	468/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.67	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	614/1489	4.58	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.57	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	3	3	10	4.00	692/1277	4.16	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	381/1279	4.52	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.60	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	435/1270	4.68	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.73	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	467/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	245/ 878	4.43	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.47	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	4.96	4.99	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: KING, ROBIN R
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1487
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: MIRANDA-ALDACO,
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1488
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	500/1576	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	608/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	480/1342	4.59	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	562/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	554/1465	4.31	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	878/1434	4.20	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	900/1547	4.36	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1288/1574	4.45	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	263/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	870/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	966/1493	4.82	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	891/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	420/1489	4.58	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	524/1277	4.16	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	312/1279	4.52	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1270	4.68	4.57	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/ 878	4.43	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 9	Required for Majors 10	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 4		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99 3	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 21 Non-major 21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 1	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 1	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 4	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: MIRANDA-ALDACO,
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1489
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	6	14	4.30	893/1576	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.30	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	6	15	4.48	653/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.48	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	671/1342	4.59	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	826/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	4	13	4.26	637/1465	4.31	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.26	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	14	4.30	625/1434	4.20	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.30	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	3	4	14	4.22	882/1547	4.36	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.22	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	7	4.29	1295/1574	4.45	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.29	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	532/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.40	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	4	14	4.36	1025/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.36	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	19	4.77	868/1493	4.82	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.77	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	821/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.41	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	14	4.45	754/1489	4.58	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.45	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	692/1277	4.16	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	543/1279	4.52	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.42	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	784/1270	4.68	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.33	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	819/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	367/ 878	4.43	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.25	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	1	0.00-0.99 0	A 10	Required for Majors 13	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 8		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99 0	C 2	General 0	Under-grad 24 Non-major 24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49 2	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 8	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 5	
			? 1		

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: BURGOS, FELIX A
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1490
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	10	4.44	727/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	608/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	406/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	768/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	1180/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.65	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	826/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.12	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	924/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.17	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	5	4.28	1309/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	10	5	4.12	860/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.12	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	1064/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.31	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	632/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	778/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	552/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.63	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	623/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.14	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	221/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: BURGOS, FELIX A
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1491
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	13	4.59	527/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.59	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	420/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	500/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	418/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	818/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.07	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	511/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.41	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	434/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.59	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1339/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.24	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	187/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.77	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	401/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	366/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	288/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	413/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	597/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.56	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	567/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	221/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.50	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	B	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	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	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1492
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	7	4	3.94	1213/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	3.94	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	1253/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	3.88	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	925/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.13	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	977/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.13	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	6	4	3.56	1221/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.56	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	0	5	5	3.44	1245/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	3.44	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	955/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	645/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.81	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	8	1	3.83	1110/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.83	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1299/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	3.93	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	1077/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.64	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	5	4	3.77	1249/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.77	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	5	6	3.93	1177/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	3.93	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	1020/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	802/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	696/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	773/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.33	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	580/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	3.86	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1492
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: COYNE, MARIA
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1493
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	6	10	4.44	727/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.44	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	392/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	333/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.72	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	453/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.56	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1194/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.63	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	878/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	794/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.29	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	739/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.76	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	783/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.19	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	982/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	759/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.82	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	720/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.47	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	602/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.59	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	4	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	692/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	419/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.55	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	808/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.27	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	464/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.00	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	11
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 9		
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	4

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0501
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1494
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	4	3	5	3.41	1478/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	3.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	1	4	3	4	3.00	1523/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	3.00	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	4	5	3.47	1221/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	3.47	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	7	4	3.59	1336/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	3.59	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	5	4	3.50	1242/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	3	4	3.13	1353/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	3.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	6	4	3.41	1376/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9	8	4.47	1115/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.47	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	4	5	2	3.29	1381/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.29	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	1	5	6	3.69	1365/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	3.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	6	9	4.24	1362/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.24	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1229/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	6	6	3.88	1205/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	3.88	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1056/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.43	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	3	1	6	3	3.69	989/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.69	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	2	1	5	5	4.00	928/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	909/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.09	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	0	6	5	4.17	415/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.17	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 7			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0	C 6	General 1	Under-grad 17	Non-major 16
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	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		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1495
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	952/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.25	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	698/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	531/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.55	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	8	4.15	953/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.15	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	850/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	8	3	8	3.85	1033/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	3.85	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	4	11	4.15	932/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.15	
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	281/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	772/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.20	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	945/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	868/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	0	0	4	5	8	4.24	973/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3	12	4.50	696/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	7	0	1	0	4	6	5	3.88	818/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.88	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	952/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1011/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	3.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1029/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	3.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	383/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.22	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0701
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1496
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	12	4.75	301/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.75	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	448/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.63	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	455/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	768/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.33	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	708/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	270/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	387/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	237/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.69	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	798/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.56	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	561/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.87	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0	12	4.71	181/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.71	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	287/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.73	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	260/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.91	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	479/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	129/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.80	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0701
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1496
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	3						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1497
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	4	8	4.18	1035/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.18	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	4	7	4.06	1100/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.06	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	696/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.41	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	815/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	3	7	3.76	1095/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.76	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	816/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.13	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	1041/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.00	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	851/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	886/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.07	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	1079/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.29	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	1193/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.53	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	2	10	4.18	1017/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.18	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	867/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.35	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	692/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	575/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.38	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	412/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	819/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.25	
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	270/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.43	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	0	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	10	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	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						
				?	1						
						Other	6				

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0901
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: COYNE, MARIA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1498
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	8	10	4.04	1124/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.04	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	5	12	4.08	1088/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.08	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	9	14	4.50	583/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	8	11	4.43	648/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.43	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	3	5	4	9	3.90	989/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.90	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	12	6	3.88	1021/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	3.88	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	6	5	9	3.75	1239/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1346/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.23	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	794/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	2	8	9	3.91	1307/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	3.91	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	3	19	4.74	947/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.74	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	10	8	4.00	1101/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	4	7	10	4.04	1096/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.04	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	3	2	4	8	3.55	997/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.55	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	393/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.58	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58	574/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.58	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	250/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.92	
4. Were special techniques successful	13	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	305/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.36	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	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	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	13						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	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	8				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH
 Instructor: COYNE, MARIA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1499
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	9	9	4.37	829/1576	4.37	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.37	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	10	4.26	929/1576	4.26	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.26	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	15	4.63	443/1342	4.63	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.63	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	0	6	10	4.21	902/1520	4.21	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	2	2	5	7	3.88	1004/1465	3.88	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.88	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	11	4.37	564/1434	4.37	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.37	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	1	4	3	8	3.63	1289/1547	3.63	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.63	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	9	7	4.28	1309/1574	4.28	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.28	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	7	7	4.18	794/1554	4.18	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.18	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	3	4	9	4.24	1126/1488	4.24	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.24	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	15	4.78	868/1493	4.78	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.78	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	5	11	4.44	763/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.44	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	2	13	4.50	696/1489	4.50	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.50	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	7	3	1	5	0	2	2.73	1210/1277	2.73	3.99	4.03	3.91	2.73	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	400/1279	4.57	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.57	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.09	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	491/1269	4.71	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.71	
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	425/ 878	4.14	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.14	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	772/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.41	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	420/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.65	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	500/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.59	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	511/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	606/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.29	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	338/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.59	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	673/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.41	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1189/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.41	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	649/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.31	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.94	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	607/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.88	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	407/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.71	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	364/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.76	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	569/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.21	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	358/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.64	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.82	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	204/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.56	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.44	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.65	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.38	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.29	****	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				Other	6						
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: AREVALO-GUERRER
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1501
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5								
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	541/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.57	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	324/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	12	12	4.79	263/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.79	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	357/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.64	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6	6	4.21	688/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.21	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	9	4.50	398/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.50	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	657/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.43	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	1079/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.50	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	222/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	198/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.92	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.93	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	336/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.79	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	489/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.31	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	184/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.88	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	288/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.88	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.88	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.88	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	10
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 6		Graduate 0
56-83	2	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		Non-major 13
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Electives	0
				Other	4

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1502
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	6	6	7	3.73	1357/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	3.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	6	3	9	3	3.32	1470/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.32	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	4	2	6	7	3.45	1229/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	3.45	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	4	0	5	8	5	3.45	1381/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	3.45	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	2	6	7	1	3.17	1355/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	5	3	8	3	3.24	1317/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	3.24	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	0	9	6	3	3.18	1427/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	3.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	8	3	3	3.38	1357/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	1	3	6	7	2	3.32	1422/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.32	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1089/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.63	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	4	3	5	4	3	2.95	1434/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	2.95	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	3	5	3	5	3.21	1389/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	3.21	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	4	3	2	3	1	2.54	1235/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	2.54	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1174/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.09	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1103/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	3.64	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1047/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.73	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	3	1	2	3	1	2.80	837/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	2.80	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 5	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	22
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
			Other		5

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0701
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1503
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	13	4.61	485/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.61	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	166/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.89	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	221/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.83		
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	228/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.78	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	708/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.20	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	435/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.47	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	135/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.89	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	15	2	4.12	1417/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.12	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	371/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.53	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	355/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.83	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	334/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	311/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.78	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	420/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.72	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	1	3	3	6	3.67	943/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.67	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.70	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	355/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.80	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	152/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.70	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 7	Required for Majors	13
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7		
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 1	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0	Under-grad	18
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
			I 0		
			? 0	Other	3

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0801
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1504
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	9	6	4.17	1042/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.17	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	8	6	4.18	1014/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.18	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	12	4.61	467/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.61	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	10	6	4.22	891/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.22	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	1	5	7	3	3.75	1102/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.75	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	3	9	4	4.06	852/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.06	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	3	7	4	3.65	1285/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	3.65	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	2	15	4	4.88	508/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.88	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	1	4	5	4	3.86	1096/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1192/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.13	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	390/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.94	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	3	5	8	4.31	911/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.31	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	845/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.38	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	1	2	1	4	2	3.40	1066/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	2	4	4.14	745/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.14	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	3	4	4.57	582/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.57	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	5	2	4.29	803/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.29	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	187/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.60	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	14
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 7		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		Under-grad 18
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 201 0901
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1505
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	7	4.29	916/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.29	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	420/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.64	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	683/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.43	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	7	4.36	744/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.36	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	6	4	3.71	1130/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	2	7	4.17	777/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.17	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	10	4.57	445/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.57	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	316/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.60	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	736/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.62	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	708/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.85	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	735/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.46	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	742/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.46	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	3	0	1	3	5	3.58	983/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.58	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	802/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	696/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.44	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	567/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.63	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	179/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.63	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	12
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 6		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	0
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0		
			? 0		
				Other	1
				#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1506
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	500/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	301/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	552/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	476/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	498/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	398/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	657/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	624/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	422/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	155/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	309/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 4		Graduate 1
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	C 4	General	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	D 0		Non-major 15
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	6
			? 0		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1507
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	1	9	4.07	1106/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.07	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	608/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	430/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.64	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	239/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.77	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	8	3.92	961/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.92	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	848/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.07	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	280/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.71	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.71	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	805/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.17	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	624/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.69	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	841/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.38	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	0	10	4.31	921/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.31	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	438/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.36	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	413/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.56	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.89	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	421/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	258/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.44	
Laboratory															
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.47	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.65	****	
Seminar															
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.83	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	****	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	****	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1508
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	485/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	392/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	562/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	0	5	15	4.57	429/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	2	1	6	10	4.26	637/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	11	4.30	625/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	280/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	14	7	4.33	1262/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	133/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.87
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	463/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	325/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.76
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	350/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.78
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	672/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.06
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	381/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	355/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	584/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	221/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.50
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	12	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	22	Non-major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1509
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	6	2	1	2.85	1554/1576	2.85	4.34	4.30	4.35	2.85	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	3	1	2.85	1548/1576	2.85	4.32	4.27	4.32	2.85	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	9	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.00	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	1	1	5	4	3.83	1212/1520	3.83	4.30	4.25	4.26	3.83	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	2	1	3	2	1	2.89	1418/1465	2.89	4.26	4.12	4.09	2.89	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	4	4	3.77	1087/1434	3.77	4.22	4.14	4.06	3.77	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	2	5	2	2	1	1	2.18	1534/1547	2.18	4.12	4.19	4.22	2.18	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.92	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.92	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1357/1554	3.38	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.38	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	1	5	0	3.11	1445/1488	3.11	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.11	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	1	4	3	0	3.00	1421/1486	3.00	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	2	2	3	2	3.56	1305/1489	3.56	4.40	4.32	4.31	3.56	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	997/1277	3.56	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.56	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1279	****	4.30	4.17	4.14	****	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1270	****	4.57	4.35	4.30	****	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****	
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.19	4.05	3.92	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 9	Required for Majors	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		Graduate 0
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 0		13
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3
			P 0		
			I 0	Other	5
			? 1		

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 202H 0101
 Title INTERMED SPAN II HONR
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 1
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1510
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.13	4.10	4.05	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1452/1488	3.00	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.99	4.03	4.01	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	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1511
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	582/1576	3.94	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.55	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	683/1576	3.89	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.45	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	583/1342	4.14	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	339/1520	4.17	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.67	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	122/1465	4.79	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.91	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	296/1434	4.37	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1145/1547	3.51	4.12	4.19	4.21	3.91	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.06	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.90	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	1194/1554	3.44	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.71	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	870/1488	3.92	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	4.89	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	561/1486	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.60	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	461/1489	4.18	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.70	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	692/1277	4.33	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.20	5.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.75	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.83	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	535/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	164/ 878	4.58	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.67	
Seminar															
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.12	5.00	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.24	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	7
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	9				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0201
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 10

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1512
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Instructor		Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank					
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	0	3.33	1494/1576	3.94	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	5	0	3.33	1463/1576	3.89	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1123/1342	4.14	4.48	4.32	4.30	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1300/1520	4.17	4.30	4.25	4.25	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1465	4.79	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	826/1434	4.37	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	5	0	3.11	1446/1547	3.51	4.12	4.19	4.21	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	1564/1574	4.06	4.55	4.64	4.61	3.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1415/1554	3.44	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	6	0	3.33	1418/1488	3.92	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.89	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1245/1486	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	0	3.67	1283/1489	4.18	4.40	4.32	4.34	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	4.33	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	445/1279	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1270	4.75	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	644/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	221/ 878	4.58	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 5	Required for Majors 0	Graduate 0 Major 4
28-55	5	1.00-1.99 0	B 1		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 0	C 0	General 1	Under-grad 10 Non-major 6
84-150	0	3.00-3.49 1	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 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 19
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1513
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	5	3	4	3.92	1231/1576	4.28	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.92	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	5	1	3.17	1503/1576	3.87	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.17	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	899/1342	4.44	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.17	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	1041/1520	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	738/1465	4.30	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.17	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	4	3.92	991/1434	4.07	4.22	4.14	4.15	3.92	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	1	2	4	1	2.75	1500/1547	3.63	4.12	4.19	4.21	2.75	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	4	2	2	3	1	2.58	1569/1574	3.45	4.55	4.64	4.61	2.58	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	3	4	2	3.55	1288/1554	3.77	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.55	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1406/1488	3.99	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	810/1493	4.83	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1273/1486	4.06	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.70	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	5	4.10	1065/1489	4.37	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.10	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	489/1277	4.15	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.30	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	554/1279	4.62	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.40	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1270	4.96	4.57	4.35	4.42	5.00	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1269	4.92	4.38	4.35	4.41	5.00	
4. Were special techniques successful	7	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	187/ 878	4.47	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.60	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.37	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	4
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	12	Non-major	8
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	10				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 16
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1514
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	Frequencies								Instructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	
General															
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	443/1576	4.28	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	515/1576	3.87	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.57	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	11	4.71	345/1342	4.44	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.71	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	291/1520	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.71	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	483/1465	4.30	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.43	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	727/1434	4.07	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.21	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	527/1547	3.63	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	4	4.31	1288/1574	3.45	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.31	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	924/1554	3.77	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	786/1488	3.99	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.57	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.83	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.86	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	792/1486	4.06	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.43	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	526/1489	4.37	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.64	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	692/1277	4.15	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.00	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	204/1279	4.62	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.83	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	234/1270	4.96	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.92	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	353/1269	4.92	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	322/ 878	4.47	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.33	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	10				
			? 1						

Course-Section: SPAN 304 0101
 Title SPAN:FOR HERITAGE SPEA
 Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1515
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	7	4.78	277/1576	4.78	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.78	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.75	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	454/1465	4.44	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.44	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.67	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	624/1547	4.44	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.44	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.33	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1554	4.86	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.86	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	945/1488	4.44	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.44	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.67	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.33	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1107/1277	3.25	3.99	4.03	4.11	3.25	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.86	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.86	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.86	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	5.00	

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101
 Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1516
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	11	4.73	324/1576	4.73	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.73	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1049/1576	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.13	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.67	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.29	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.60	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.40	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	947/1547	4.13	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.13	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	795/1574	4.73	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.73	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1285/1554	3.56	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.56	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.40	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.93	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.20	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	347/1277	4.47	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.47	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	625/1279	4.31	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.31	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1270	4.31	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.31	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	4	2	5	3.69	1058/1269	3.69	4.38	4.35	4.41	3.69	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	339/ 878	4.30	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.30	

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0						
				Other	10						
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101
 Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1517
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	0	19	4.81	243/1576	4.81	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.81	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.71	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	179/1342	4.90	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.90	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	348/1520	4.65	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.65	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.71	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	498/1434	4.43	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.43	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	228/1547	4.76	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.76	
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.95	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.95	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	339/1554	4.57	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.57	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	124/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.95	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.95	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	271/1486	4.81	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.81	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	121/1277	4.84	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.84	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	253/1279	4.76	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.76	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	345/1270	4.81	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.81	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.75	
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	187/ 878	4.60	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.60	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.48	****	
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.16	****	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.17	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	****/ 375	****	4.97	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 326	****	4.99	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101
 Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1517
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	18				
				?	3						

Course-Section: SPAN 311 0101
 Title INTRO TO SPANISH LIT
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1518
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.63
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	455/1342	4.63	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	291/1520	4.71	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1465	4.88	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	305/1434	4.63	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	387/1547	4.63	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	3.88	1526/1574	3.88	4.55	4.64	4.61	3.88
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	160/1554	4.80	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1181/1488	4.14	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.14
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486	4.86	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	434/1489	4.71	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	355/1270	4.80	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	386/1269	4.80	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	3	1	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	367/ 878	4.25	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 5	Required for Majors	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99 0	B 2		Graduate 0
56-83	1	2.00-2.99 2	C 0	General	1
84-150	4	3.00-3.49 0	D 0		Under-grad 8
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 312 0101
 Title INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1519
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	8	4.64	457/1576	4.64	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.64	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.60	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.70	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	311/1520	4.70	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.70	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	225/1465	4.73	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.73	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	296/1434	4.64	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.64	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	978/1547	4.09	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.09	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.91	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.80	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.80	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.80	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	309/1277	4.50	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.50	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.78	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.67	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	421/1269	4.78	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.78	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	383/ 878	4.22	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.22	
Laboratory															
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****	
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.48	****	
Seminar															
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****	
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****	
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****	
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	****	4.97	4.01	4.12	****	
Field Work															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.37	****	
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****	
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****	
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	****	4.99	4.03	4.23	****	
Self Paced															
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****	
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****	
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****	
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	4.24	****	

Course-Section: SPAN 312 0101
 Title INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1519
 JUL 2, 2009
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 401 0101
 Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 5

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1520
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	2	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.00	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	996/1576	4.20	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.20	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.48	4.32	4.46	****	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3.00	1466/1520	3.00	4.30	4.25	4.38	3.00	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.00	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.22	4.14	4.30	4.00	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	690/1547	4.40	4.12	4.19	4.24	4.40	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.55	4.64	4.69	4.80	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	3.00	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1233/1488	4.00	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.00	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.80	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.00	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	3.60	1298/1489	3.60	4.40	4.32	4.38	3.60	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	3.40	1066/1277	3.40	3.99	4.03	4.04	3.40	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.30	4.17	4.31	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.50	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	3.50	1116/1269	3.50	4.38	4.35	4.55	3.50	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.19	4.05	4.33	4.50	

Frequency Distribution

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

- Means there are not enough responses to be significant

Course-Section: SPAN 421 0101
 Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 3
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1521
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	0	1	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.34	4.30	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1523/1576	3.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.48	4.32	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1362/1520	3.50	4.30	4.25	4.38	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1204/1434	3.50	4.22	4.14	4.30	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1538/1547	2.00	4.12	4.19	4.24	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.69	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1452/1488	3.00	4.39	4.47	4.55	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.40	4.32	4.38	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.99	4.03	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.30	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	1249/1270	2.50	4.57	4.35	4.53	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1259/1269	2.00	4.38	4.35	4.55	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	4.19	4.05	4.33	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101
 Title TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI
 Instructor: MEDINA, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1522
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	8	4.89	179/1576	4.89	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1576	4.63	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342	4.75	4.48	4.32	4.46	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.30	4.25	4.38	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.22	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	473/1434	4.44	4.22	4.14	4.30	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.69	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	1018/1488	4.38	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	888/1489	4.33	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	3	0	5	3.89	812/1277	3.89	3.99	4.03	4.04	3.89
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.31	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.53	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269	5.00	4.38	4.35	4.55	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	0	7	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.19	4.05	4.33	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 601 0101
 Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 2
 Questionnaires: 2

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1523
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	1	1	0	3.50	1445/1576	3.50	4.34	4.30	4.43	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576	4.50	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1342	5.00	4.48	4.32	4.38	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1520	5.00	4.30	4.25	4.36	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.13	4.10	4.18	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1421/1486	3.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1274/1277	1.00	3.99	4.03	4.08	1.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1186/1279	3.00	4.30	4.17	4.34	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	928/1269	4.00	4.38	4.35	4.55	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	877/ 878	1.00	4.19	4.05	4.11	1.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 621 0101
 Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 6
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2009

Page 1524
 JUL 2, 2009
 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	4	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.43	4.50	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.67	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.48	4.32	4.38	4.50	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.25	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.22	4.14	4.35	4.33	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1196/1547	3.83	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.83	
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.75	5.00	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.18	4.50	
Lecture															
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.50	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.50	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.67	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	974/1277	3.60	3.99	4.03	4.08	3.60	
Discussion															
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.30	4.17	4.34	4.00	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.20	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1018/1269	3.80	4.38	4.35	4.55	3.80	
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	603/ 878	3.80	4.19	4.05	4.11	3.80	
Field Work															
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	****	4.99	4.03	4.10	****	
Self Paced															
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	4.13	****	

Frequency Distribution

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