

Course-Section: SPAN 101 01
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: DeLutis-Eichenb
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 30

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1354
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	7	22	4.70	375/1447	3.84	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	112/1447	3.87	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	28	4.90	141/1241	4.06	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	26	4.83	143/1402	3.92	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	5	20	4.61	280/1358	4.11	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	3	22	4.57	332/1316	3.74	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	25	4.77	191/1427	3.54	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	2	26	4.83	700/1447	4.72	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	2	0	0	0	6	16	4.73	182/1434	3.69	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	1	27	4.90	215/1387	3.65	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.90
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	29	5.00	1/1387	4.67	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	26	4.90	147/1386	3.74	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.90
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	26	4.86	204/1380	3.97	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	1	25	4.79	112/1193	3.74	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.79
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	350/1172	4.06	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	119/1182	4.58	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.94
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	0	1	16	4.72	427/1170	4.28	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.72
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	87/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.82

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 21	Required for Majors 11	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 11	Under-grad 30	Non-major 30
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	7	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 4	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 101 02
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: Sloane,Robert A
 Enrollment: 34
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1355
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	3	4	8	5	3.50	1339/1447	3.84	4.31	4.31	4.18	3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	5	5	6	3.36	1356/1447	3.87	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	6	8	3.77	1062/1241	4.06	4.48	4.33	4.25	3.77
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	5	2	1	7	3	4	3.35	1301/1402	3.92	4.36	4.24	4.15	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	0	1	6	4	7	3.94	869/1358	4.11	4.26	4.11	4.03	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	5	4	1	4	2	4	3.07	1252/1316	3.74	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	1	4	4	6	3	2	2.74	1379/1427	3.54	4.21	4.19	4.24	2.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	14	5	4.26	1246/1447	4.72	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.26
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	3	1	1	8	2	3.33	1293/1434	3.69	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	4	3	4	6	3	3.05	1347/1387	3.65	4.45	4.46	4.46	3.05
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	1237/1387	4.67	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.32
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	3	5	4	4	3.16	1314/1386	3.74	4.35	4.32	4.32	3.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	3	2	4	5	6	3.45	1258/1380	3.97	4.43	4.32	4.31	3.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	3	1	5	6	3	3.28	1037/1193	3.74	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.28
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	2	8	4	3.81	853/1172	4.06	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	3	7	6	4.19	774/1182	4.58	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.19
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	3	6	3	3	3.40	1100/1170	4.28	4.41	4.38	4.17	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	3	5	3	2	3.31	710/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	3.31
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 2	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 12	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 101 03
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: Messick,Rosalie
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1356
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	2	6	7	8	3.58	1318/1447	3.84	4.31	4.31	4.18	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	3	4	11	5	3.46	1333/1447	3.87	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.46
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	8	5	8	3.58	1124/1241	4.06	4.48	4.33	4.25	3.58
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	2	4	9	8	3.88	1094/1402	3.92	4.36	4.24	4.15	3.88
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	1	4	5	12	3.88	931/1358	4.11	4.26	4.11	4.03	3.88
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	4	0	6	5	9	3.63	1075/1316	3.74	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.63
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	3	4	9	7	3.54	1249/1427	3.54	4.21	4.19	4.24	3.54
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	2	23	4.85	646/1447	4.72	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	4	2	4	7	4	3.24	1317/1434	3.69	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.24
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	3	3	6	7	3	3.18	1338/1387	3.65	4.45	4.46	4.46	3.18
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	2	6	14	4.55	1107/1387	4.67	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	4	1	2	6	7	3.55	1247/1386	3.74	4.35	4.32	4.32	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	1	3	9	6	3.64	1208/1380	3.97	4.43	4.32	4.31	3.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	6	9	1	2	0	5	3	3.64	911/1193	3.74	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.64
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	1	1	3	4	3.80	859/1172	4.06	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	400/1182	4.58	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	576/1170	4.28	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	16	2	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	335/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.25

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 13	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	B 9						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 0	General	15	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	0				
			? 1						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 04
 Title Elementary Spanish I
 Instructor: Messick,Rosalie
 Enrollment: 33
 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1357
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	12	4	6	3.58	1315/1447	3.84	4.31	4.31	4.18	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	7	7	7	3.75	1228/1447	3.87	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	4	3	13	4.00	923/1241	4.06	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	2	6	7	5	3.62	1223/1402	3.92	4.36	4.24	4.15	3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	0	5	6	11	4.00	799/1358	4.11	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	7	4	6	3.68	1038/1316	3.74	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.68
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	4	3	9	2	6	3.13	1354/1427	3.54	4.21	4.19	4.24	3.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	4.96	243/1447	4.72	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.96
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	2	8	7	2	3.47	1249/1434	3.69	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	4	7	5	6	3.48	1307/1387	3.65	4.45	4.46	4.46	3.48
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	20	4.83	732/1387	4.67	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	3	9	5	4	3.36	1287/1386	3.74	4.35	4.32	4.32	3.36
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	8	8	3.91	1096/1380	3.97	4.43	4.32	4.31	3.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	3	1	3	5	3	3.27	1039/1193	3.74	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	6	1	7	4.07	683/1172	4.06	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.07
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	553/1182	4.58	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	576/1170	4.28	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	3	1	0	3	2	5	3.91	512/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	3.91

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 4	General 13	Under-grad 24	Non-major 24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 1			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 2			

Course-Section: SPAN 102 01
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Burgos,Felix A
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1358
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	14	5.00	1/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	89/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.93
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	186/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	186/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.79	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	117/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	312/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	69/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11	3	4.21	1275/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	290/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	160/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	227/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	3	0	6	4.10	612/1193	3.73	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	135/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	364/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	150/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.63

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C 4	General 5	Under-grad 14	Non-major 14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	3	D 1			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

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	2	23	4.92	118/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	20	4.79	206/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.79
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	21	4.80	165/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	107/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.87
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	112/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	200/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	14	4.58	1030/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.58
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	117/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	160/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	22	4.88	159/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	64/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	0	1	7	13	4.41	376/1193	3.73	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.41
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	2	10	4.69	261/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.69
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	261/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.85
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	178/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.92
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	1	0	1	10	4.67	133/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	23	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.31	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	24	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 13	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 5			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C 2	General 12	Under-grad 25	Non-major 24
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives 2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 0		
				? 1			

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	1	1	7	2	15	4.12	998/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	3	3	6	13	4.04	1035/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.04
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	2	4	5	11	3.76	1065/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	3.76
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	3	4	6	11	4.04	949/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.04
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	2	1	1	3	7	10	4.09	751/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	5	5	10	3.83	950/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	5	6	11	4.04	948/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.04
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	592/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.87
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	5	5	8	4.17	733/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	1	3	4	17	4.35	960/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	22	4.81	784/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	1	5	5	14	4.15	962/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.15
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	3	18	4.38	775/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	2	1	4	3	13	4.04	636/1193	3.73	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.04
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	648/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	2	2	2	9	4.20	767/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	1	2	4	7	4.00	864/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	0	2	3	2	7	4.00	423/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.00
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.08	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 58	****	4.80	4.41	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	3.64	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: SPAN 102 03
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Carmody, Sean P
 Enrollment: 31
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1360
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A	6	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	7	General	15	Under-grad	26	Non-major	26
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 04
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Westphal,German
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1361
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	4	3	1	1	2.55	1439/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	2.55
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	5	3	2	0	2.55	1429/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	2.55
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	5	3	1	2	0	2.00	1237/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	2.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	1402/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.15	1.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	6	2	1	2	0	0	2.00	1352/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	2.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	1316/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	1.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	919/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	485/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	4	1	3	1	0	2.11	1422/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	2.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	2	5	1	1	2.73	1366/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	2.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	4	6	0	3.45	1365/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	3.45
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	5	2	3	1	0	2.00	1380/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	2.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	6	1	3	1	0	1.91	1375/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	1.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	4	0	2	1	0	2.00	1165/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	2.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	2	0	2	1	2.71	1162/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	2.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	4	1	0	2	0	2.00	1169/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors		

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors		1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5							
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C	3	General		8	Under-grad	11	Non-major	11
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	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				
				?	1							

Course-Section: SPAN 102 05
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Quiroga, Maria I
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1362
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	2	5	7	4	3.58	1318/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	3.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	0	7	5	5	3.58	1297/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	1	7	9	4.21	814/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	6	6	6	3.89	1082/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.15	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	3	3	6	5	3.47	1182/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	3.47
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	3	9	3.95	870/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	2	5	5	6	3.68	1192/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	786/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.79
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	4	6	2	3.69	1131/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.69
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	6	7	4	3.88	1233/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	3.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	844/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.76
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	7	6	2	3.47	1265/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	3.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	5	5	3	3.29	1292/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	3.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	4	3	5	3	3.31	1028/1193	3.73	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.31
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	580/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.25
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	737/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	864/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	423/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.00
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 3	General 6	Under-grad 19	Non-major 19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D 1			
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 0		
				? 2			

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	1	2	2	4	7	3.88	1182/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	2	2	3	7	3.87	1168/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.87
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	3	2	8	4.07	896/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.07
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	3	6	3.80	1139/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.15	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	1	3	2	6	3.64	1097/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	1	2	2	4	4	3.62	1081/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	1	4	6	3.86	1110/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	646/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	3	3	1	3.10	1340/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	1	2	3	3	3	3.42	1315/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	3.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	1197/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.42
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	3	1	3	3	2	3.00	1328/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	3.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	2	4	2	3.17	1306/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	3.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	3	0	1	2	2	3.00	1087/1193	3.73	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	2	0	0	2	1	3.00	1090/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	1	0	0	3	1	3.60	1053/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	3.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	1	2	0	3.25	1117/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	3.25
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	1	0	0	2	0	3.00	****/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	****
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	3.78	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	3.84	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	3.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 07
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Strickling,Laur
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1364
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	2	10	5	3.89	1166/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	3.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	728/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	814/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	9	7	4.21	807/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	4	7	5	3.58	1138/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	3.58
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	7	6	4.00	812/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	2	14	4.47	500/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.47
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	511/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.89
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43	431/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.43
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	698/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	317/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	13	4.47	649/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	6	10	4.37	791/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	2	0	4	4	6	3.75	843/1193	3.73	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.75
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	559/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	508/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	854/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.07
4. Were special techniques successful	5	3	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	324/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.27
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 3	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	C 7	General	10	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	D 0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	1				
			? 0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 08
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Strickling,Laur
 Enrollment: 35
 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1365
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	7	10	10	4.04	1042/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	10	12	4.26	853/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	2	10	13	4.18	838/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.18
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	11	13	4.25	766/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	5	14	7	3.89	924/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	3.89
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	1	8	12	4	3.76	991/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	1	5	7	13	4.00	971/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	4.86	619/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	3	9	9	4.29	600/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	9	13	4.40	902/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	24	4.92	422/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	5	7	13	4.23	895/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	8	14	4.38	775/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	3	3	2	7	3	5	3.25	1041/1193	3.73	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	1	2	4	8	4.06	687/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.06
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	2	12	4.50	553/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	390/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	1	4	3	7	3.88	527/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	3.88

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	A 4	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 12						
56-83	8	2.00-2.99	C 10	General	17	Under-grad	28	Non-major	28
84-150	4	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				
			? 0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 09
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Hernandez, Milvi
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1366
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	2	3	10	4	3.84	1206/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	3.84
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	9	2	3.58	1297/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.58
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	8	8	4.21	814/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.21
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	6	7	3.89	1082/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.15	3.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	8	7	4.16	700/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	6	5	4	3.32	1208/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	3.32
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	4	4	2	8	3.63	1214/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	3.63
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	803/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	0	5	5	2	3.54	1223/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	4	7	5	3.83	1245/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	3.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	1252/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.28
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	9	5	3	3.50	1258/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	5	5	6	3.83	1138/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	3.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	2	3	5	7	4.00	652/1193	3.73	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	5	5	5	3.81	853/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.81
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	737/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	864/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	2	4	4	4	3.71	596/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	3.71
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.18	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.31	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.46	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.37	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	2	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 168	****	3.67	4.20	4.29	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	3.95	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 62	****	4.90	4.56	4.08	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 65	****	4.55	4.42	3.78	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 64	****	4.45	4.09	3.75	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	4.65	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Course-Section: SPAN 102 09
 Title Elementary Spanish II
 Instructor: Hernandez, Milvi
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1366
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	13	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

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	3	2	3	2	4	3.14	1396/1447	3.90	4.31	4.31	4.18	3.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	2	2	1	5	3.07	1393/1447	3.90	4.34	4.27	4.30	3.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	1	4	1	5	3.29	1182/1241	3.98	4.48	4.33	4.25	3.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	7	3	1	1	0	2	2.57	1390/1402	3.72	4.36	4.24	4.15	2.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	1	1	7	3.50	1170/1358	3.81	4.26	4.11	4.03	3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	8	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	671/1316	3.71	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	739/1427	4.17	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	388/1447	4.77	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	7	1	2	0	3	2.31	1415/1434	3.70	4.12	4.10	4.10	2.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	3	1	1	4	5	3.50	1304/1387	4.05	4.45	4.46	4.46	3.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	3	2	1	4	4	3.29	1374/1387	4.49	4.78	4.73	4.71	3.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	2	1	2	6	3.43	1278/1386	3.80	4.35	4.32	4.32	3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	5	2	2	1	4	2.79	1338/1380	3.79	4.43	4.32	4.31	2.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	12	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/1193	3.73	4.02	4.02	3.99	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	2	3	0	3	3.00	1090/1172	3.81	4.26	4.15	3.95	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	3	1	4	0	2	2.70	1164/1182	4.05	4.56	4.35	4.18	2.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	6	1	1	0	2	2.10	1168/1170	3.79	4.41	4.38	4.17	2.10
4. Were special techniques successful	4	5	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	683/ 800	4.07	4.17	4.06	3.95	3.40
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	12	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.31	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 66	****	3.99	4.58	3.95	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	3.83	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	13	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 36	****	4.70	4.25	4.26	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	4.50	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	4.38	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	4.49	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	4.31	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	1	Required for Majors	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	4	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 103 01
 Title Int Rev Elem Spanish
 Instructor: Garcia,Tareixa
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1368
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	4	15	4.62	463/1447	4.33	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.62
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	112/1447	4.58	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	231/1241	4.71	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	259/1402	4.64	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	312/1358	4.47	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	292/1316	4.50	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.60
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	4.43	568/1427	4.30	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	8	4.38	1168/1447	4.47	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	9	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	634/1434	4.07	4.12	4.10	4.10	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	490/1387	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	656/1387	4.88	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	587/1386	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.52
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	326/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	0	1	0	9	4.45	332/1193	4.19	4.02	4.02	3.99	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/1172	4.13	4.26	4.15	3.95	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1182	4.25	4.56	4.35	4.18	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	18	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/1170	4.13	4.41	4.38	4.17	****
4. Were special techniques successful	18	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	3.95	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	1	A 11	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	1	B 6			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	General 13	Under-grad 21	Non-major 20
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 103 02
 Title Int Rev Elem Spanish
 Instructor: Quiroga, Maria I
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1369
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	5	8	9	4.04	1037/1447	4.33	4.31	4.31	4.18	4.04
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	7	12	4.26	843/1447	4.58	4.34	4.27	4.30	4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	14	4.61	451/1241	4.71	4.48	4.33	4.25	4.61
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	14	4.57	425/1402	4.64	4.36	4.24	4.15	4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	7	1	0	0	6	9	4.38	485/1358	4.47	4.26	4.11	4.03	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	6	14	4.39	504/1316	4.50	4.27	4.14	3.99	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	4	7	11	4.17	858/1427	4.30	4.21	4.19	4.24	4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	4.57	1042/1447	4.47	4.66	4.69	4.68	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	4	11	4	3.90	983/1434	4.07	4.12	4.10	4.10	3.90
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	4	4	13	4.43	881/1387	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.46	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	528/1387	4.88	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.90
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	8	10	4.24	895/1386	4.38	4.35	4.32	4.32	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	6	11	4.33	815/1380	4.55	4.43	4.32	4.31	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	0	4	7	3	3.93	737/1193	4.19	4.02	4.02	3.99	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	660/1172	4.13	4.26	4.15	3.95	4.13
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	737/1182	4.25	4.56	4.35	4.18	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	1	0	0	3	4	4.13	839/1170	4.13	4.41	4.38	4.17	4.13
4. Were special techniques successful	15	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	267/ 800	4.38	4.17	4.06	3.95	4.38

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	1	B	9						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	12	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 01
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Morales, Daniel
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1370
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	6	9	4.33	790/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	619/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	13	4.56	496/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	4	6	7	4.18	845/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	4	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	952/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	3.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	617/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.25
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	7	2	7	3.88	1090/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	13	4	4.17	1301/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	9	5	4.19	712/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	9	7	4.35	951/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	8	7	4.29	1244/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	847/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	5	10	4.41	749/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	652/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	261/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	400/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.70
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	3	4	3	4.00	864/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	2	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	581/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	3.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 1	General 12	Under-grad 18	Non-major 18
84-150	3	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 02
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Morales, Daniel
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1371
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	0	6	15	4.48	626/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.48
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	315/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	345/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	3	17	4.68	292/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.68
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	1	1	4	3	9	4.00	799/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	5	14	4.35	542/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	14	4.39	608/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.39
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	13	8	4.32	1216/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.32
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	0	0	0	2	6	5	4.23	657/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.23
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	3	4	14	4.52	769/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.52
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	1042/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.62
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	431/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	5	16	4.76	326/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.76
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	9	10	4.45	340/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.45
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	377/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	1	0	3	6	4.40	638/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	459/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	14	3	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.17

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 12	Required for Majors 5	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 4			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 12	Under-grad 23	Non-major 23
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	5	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 0		
				? 2			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 03
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Curto,Natalia
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1372
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	5	17	4.70	375/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	4.78	217/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	177/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	83/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	5	5	9	4.00	799/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	4	16	4.64	265/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	19	4.74	219/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	14	8	4.36	1182/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.36
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	0	13	7	4.19	701/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.19
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	200/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	4	18	4.82	758/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	194/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	20	4.91	159/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	16	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	796/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	218/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	390/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	11	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	71/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.92
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 189	****	3.00	4.34	4.47	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 192	****	4.00	4.34	4.38	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 186	****	****	4.48	4.57	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 187	****	3.67	4.33	4.46	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	16	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 04
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Gomez-Rubio,Mar
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1373
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	8	5	7	3.81	1238/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	3	8	7	3.90	1141/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	3.90
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	8	9	4.25	782/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	3	0	0	3	9	5	4.12	900/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	2	1	3	7	5	3.67	1084/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	3	3	6	5	3.47	1145/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	4	6	9	4.00	971/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	485/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	4	2	7	3	3.56	1208/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	3.56

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	5	7	7	4.11	1144/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.11
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1018/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	5	4	7	3.74	1198/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	3.74
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	3	3	4	9	3.85	1128/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	3.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	3	0	5	3	6	3.53	953/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.53

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	2	2	3	4	3.82	853/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	3.82
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	527/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	657/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	11	4	0	0	2	2	2	4.00	423/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 4	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	4	C 4	General 16	Under-grad 21	Non-major 21
84-150	1	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 05
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Gomez-Rubio,Mar
 Enrollment: 27
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1374
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	4	7	4.29	839/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	677/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	380/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	129/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	387/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.46
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	181/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	3	1	1	10	4.20	842/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	339/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	3	4	4.10	797/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.10
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	921/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	422/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	457/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	739/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	3	2	2	6	3.85	791/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.85
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	377/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	1	0	1	4	4.33	710/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	195/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	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	5	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	5	Under-grad	15	Non-major	15
84-150	6	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	0				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 06
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Curto,Natalia
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1375
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	3	8	11	4.22	909/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	179/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	21	4.91	127/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	19	4.86	121/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	3	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	452/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	18	4.74	181/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.74
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	2	3	15	4.52	434/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.52
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	22	5.00	1/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	309/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	353/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	264/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	431/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	273/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	4	1	1	2	4	3.08	1077/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	377/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	303/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	4	6	4.60	522/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	2	2	6	4.40	250/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.40
Field Work														
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.52	****	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	4.00	4.30	****	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 27	****	4.50	4.43	****	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 9	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 0	Major 2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 11			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 1	General 15	Under-grad 23	Non-major 21
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	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 1		
				? 2			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 07
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Curto,Natalia
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1376
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	8	17	4.68	397/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.68
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	89/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.92
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	113/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	143/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	1	1	2	7	10	4.14	709/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	1	5	17	4.70	212/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	6	18	4.75	200/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	238/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.65
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	19	4.83	322/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	3	20	4.87	182/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.87
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	22	4.96	80/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.96
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	13	1	1	0	2	5	4.00	652/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	282/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	364/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	264/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.87
4. Were special techniques successful	10	1	0	0	6	1	7	4.07	411/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.07

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 0	A 14	Required for Majors 9	Graduate 0 Major 0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	B 6		
56-83	7	2.00-2.99 1	C 3	General 15	Under-grad 25 Non-major 25
84-150	5	3.00-3.49 5	D 0		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 7	F 0	Electives 0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant
			P 0		
			I 0	Other 0	
			? 2		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 08
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Oscoz, Ana R
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1377
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	4	8	9	4.24	889/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	9	10	4.38	702/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	5	3	13	4.38	675/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	4	3	13	4.33	685/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	4	1	0	4	5	7	4.00	799/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	6	5	10	4.19	671/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.19
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	3	5	11	4.19	842/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	291/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	4	5	9	4.28	611/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.28
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	1	5	13	4.45	860/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	1	3	15	4.55	1099/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.55
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	5	11	4.25	879/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	506/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	1	2	1	4	10	4.11	602/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	428/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.44
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	219/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	243/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	177/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.56

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 8			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	4	C 6	General 12	Under-grad 22	Non-major 22
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	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 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 09
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Colombo, Laura M
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1378
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	2	5	9	4.24	889/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	303/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	404/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	766/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	1	5	8	4.06	772/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	4	3	9	4.18	690/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	582/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	478/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	245/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	369/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	316/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	339/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	4	4	8	4.25	478/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	309/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	347/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	679/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.38
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	1	0	1	1	5	4.13	398/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	

00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	13	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	7	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	0				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 10
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Colombo, Laura M
 Enrollment: 22
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1379
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	12	4.69	386/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	4.69	327/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.69
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	129/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	5	2	7	4.14	709/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	283/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.62
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	172/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	388/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	315/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	307/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	217/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	143/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	478/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	282/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	864/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.17

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 11
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Arevalo-Guerrer
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1380
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	2	6	6	4.00	1058/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	532/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	282/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	645/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.38
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	3	5	5	3.80	987/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	3.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	7	6	4.06	779/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.06
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	5	6	3.88	1097/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	836/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	4.38	491/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	626/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	604/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	2	10	4.25	879/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	593/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	4	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	478/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	350/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	329/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	364/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	7	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	398/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.13

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	B 5						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	8	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	4	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 201 12
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Arevalo-Guerrer
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1381
 JUN 28, 2010
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	2	0	5	10	4.17	954/1447	4.32	4.31	4.31	4.31	4.17
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	7	9	4.33	766/1447	4.55	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	6	11	4.50	541/1241	4.68	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	437/1402	4.57	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	3	7	5	4.00	799/1358	4.04	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	10	4.50	392/1316	4.37	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	727/1427	4.34	4.21	4.19	4.14	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	673/1447	4.76	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	374/1434	4.29	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	566/1387	4.61	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	630/1387	4.79	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	0	0	2	2	10	4.57	539/1386	4.53	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.57
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	366/1380	4.64	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	536/1193	3.98	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	****/1172	4.52	4.26	4.15	4.12	****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	****/1182	4.78	4.56	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	****/1170	4.52	4.41	4.38	4.32	****
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 800	4.25	4.17	4.06	4.01	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	5	General	9	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	2	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 202 01
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Val,Adriana
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1382
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	1	2	2	3	3.09	1402/1447	3.40	4.31	4.31	4.31	3.09
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	2	4	3.73	1239/1447	3.67	4.34	4.27	4.23	3.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	8	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	717/1241	4.17	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	916/1402	4.30	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.09
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	2	3	1	3	3.30	1240/1358	3.74	4.26	4.11	4.12	3.30
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	2	1	5	3.55	1115/1316	4.16	4.27	4.14	4.08	3.55
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	1176/1427	3.49	4.21	4.19	4.14	3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	988/1447	4.59	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	2	4	4	0	3.20	1325/1434	3.66	4.12	4.10	3.97	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	1	0	6	3	4.10	1144/1387	4.01	4.45	4.46	4.42	4.10
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	1282/1387	4.56	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.20
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	4	1	3.50	1258/1386	3.92	4.35	4.32	4.24	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	2	2	3.40	1270/1380	3.87	4.43	4.32	4.30	3.40
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	3	3	2	3.50	960/1193	3.90	4.02	4.02	4.04	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	2	2	2	0	3.00	1090/1172	4.00	4.26	4.15	4.12	3.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	4	2	4.33	691/1182	4.67	4.56	4.35	4.30	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1070/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	1	1	1	2	0	2.80	772/ 800	3.78	4.17	4.06	4.01	2.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 3	Graduate 0	Major 1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General 2	Under-grad 11	Non-major 10
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0	Electives 3	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 2		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 202 02
 Title Intermediate Spanish I
 Instructor: Messick,Rosalie
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1383
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	1	2	7	3	3.71	1273/1447	3.40	4.31	4.31	4.31	3.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	4	3	4	3.62	1282/1447	3.67	4.34	4.27	4.23	3.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	6	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	923/1241	4.17	4.48	4.33	4.35	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	494/1402	4.30	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	5	4	4.18	672/1358	3.74	4.26	4.11	4.12	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	11	4.77	158/1316	4.16	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	1	4	2	3	3.25	1331/1427	3.49	4.21	4.19	4.14	3.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	1060/1447	4.59	4.66	4.69	4.70	4.54
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	786/1434	3.66	4.12	4.10	3.97	4.11
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	1	5	4	3.92	1222/1387	4.01	4.45	4.46	4.42	3.92
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	475/1387	4.56	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	811/1386	3.92	4.35	4.32	4.24	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	815/1380	3.87	4.43	4.32	4.30	4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	440/1193	3.90	4.02	4.02	4.04	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1172	4.00	4.26	4.15	4.12	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1182	4.67	4.56	4.35	4.30	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1170	4.25	4.41	4.38	4.32	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	103/ 800	3.78	4.17	4.06	4.01	4.75

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7	Required for Majors 8	Graduate 0	Major 4
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B 3			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1	General 0	Under-grad 14	Non-major 10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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 4		
				? 2			

Course-Section: SPAN 301 01
 Title Advanced Spanish I
 Instructor: Arevalo-Guerrer
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1384
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	6	5	4.45	654/1447	4.45	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	728/1447	4.36	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	599/1241	4.45	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	249/1402	4.73	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	194/1358	4.73	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	122/1316	4.82	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	3	4.09	919/1427	4.09	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	485/1447	4.91	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	4.36	503/1434	4.36	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.36
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	337/1387	4.82	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.82
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	528/1387	4.91	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	677/1386	4.45	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	379/1380	4.73	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	288/1193	4.50	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	163/1172	4.83	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	271/1182	4.83	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	159/ 800	4.60	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.60

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 2	Required for Majors 7	Graduate 1	Major 2
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B 6			
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C 2	General 1	Under-grad 10	Non-major 9
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	0	D 0			
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives 1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant	
				P 0			
				I 0	Other 1		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 302 01
 Title Advanced Spanish II
 Instructor: Curto,Natalia
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1385
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	5	4.83	222/1447	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	532/1447	4.32	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	204/1241	4.49	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	854/1402	4.08	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	122/1358	4.63	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	392/1316	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	0	2	3	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	1301/1447	4.30	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.17
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	4.40	454/1434	4.12	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1387	4.71	4.45	4.46	4.44	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	1055/1387	4.66	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	510/1386	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	273/1380	4.47	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1172	4.80	4.26	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1182	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1170	4.70	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	133/ 800	4.63	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302 02
 Title Advanced Spanish II
 Instructor: Bell,Alan S
 Enrollment: 11
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1386
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	1	4	4.29	839/1447	4.56	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	956/1447	4.32	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	855/1241	4.49	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	976/1402	4.08	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	430/1358	4.63	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	590/1316	4.39	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	971/1427	4.00	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	1139/1447	4.30	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.43
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1031/1434	4.12	4.12	4.10	4.09	3.83
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	4.43	881/1387	4.71	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	919/1387	4.66	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	971/1386	4.37	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	0	5	4.14	971/1380	4.47	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	420/1193	4.33	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	323/1172	4.80	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	4.20	767/1182	4.60	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	657/1170	4.70	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.40
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	159/ 800	4.63	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.60

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 304 01
 Title Span:For Heritage Spea
 Instructor: Schwartz,Ana M
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1387
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1182/1447	3.88	4.31	4.31	4.32	3.88
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	974/1447	4.13	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.13
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	683/1241	4.38	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	0	5	4.13	891/1402	4.13	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	1022/1358	3.75	4.26	4.11	4.10	3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	719/1316	4.14	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1164/1427	3.75	4.21	4.19	4.15	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	4.13	1321/1447	4.13	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	733/1434	4.17	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	1	2	3.67	1282/1387	3.67	4.45	4.46	4.44	3.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1160/1386	3.83	4.35	4.32	4.30	3.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	1	4	4.17	959/1380	4.17	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	0	1	3.50	960/1193	3.50	4.02	4.02	4.05	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	377/1172	4.50	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	430/1182	4.67	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	0	3	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	3.50	655/ 800	3.50	4.17	4.06	4.12	3.50
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 21	****	5.00	4.57	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.64	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 20	****	****	4.60	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	7	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 15	****	****	4.61	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 01
 Title Espana Y Sus Culturas
 Instructor: Bell,Alan S
 Enrollment: 14
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1388
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	5	4.44	667/1447	4.44	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	479/1447	4.56	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	380/1241	4.67	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	4.00	976/1402	4.00	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	312/1358	4.56	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	3.67	1050/1316	3.67	4.27	4.14	4.13	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	811/1427	4.22	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1202/1447	4.33	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	4	1	3.86	1017/1434	3.86	4.12	4.10	4.09	3.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	860/1387	4.44	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	579/1387	4.89	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	0	5	3	4.11	997/1386	4.11	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	5	3	4.00	1030/1380	4.00	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	3.78	831/1193	3.78	4.02	4.02	4.05	3.78
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.26	4.15	4.24	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	521/1182	4.56	4.56	4.35	4.42	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	2	2	2	3	3.67	1013/1170	3.67	4.41	4.38	4.49	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	2	1	2	3	3.75	581/ 800	3.75	4.17	4.06	4.12	3.75

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 308 01
 Title Latinoamerica Y Sus Cu
 Instructor: Stolle-McAllist
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1389
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	10	4.69	375/1447	4.69	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.69
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	702/1447	4.38	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	675/1241	4.38	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	157/1402	4.82	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	272/1358	4.62	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	486/1316	4.42	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	8	4.46	513/1427	4.46	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.46
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	646/1447	4.85	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	270/1434	4.62	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.62
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	566/1387	4.67	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.67
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	982/1387	4.67	4.78	4.73	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	607/1386	4.50	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	2	9	4.58	571/1380	4.58	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.58
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	478/1193	4.25	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1172	5.00	4.26	4.15	4.24	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1170	5.00	4.41	4.38	4.49	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/ 800	5.00	4.17	4.06	4.12	5.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 38	****	5.00	4.49	4.73	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 31	****	5.00	4.72	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	9
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	13	Non-major	4
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	Other	0				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SPAN 312 01
 Title Intro To Latin Amer Li
 Instructor: Schneider, Judit
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1390
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	7	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.32	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1447	4.75	4.34	4.27	4.23	4.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	282/1241	4.75	4.48	4.33	4.33	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	217/1402	4.75	4.36	4.24	4.24	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	173/1358	4.75	4.26	4.11	4.10	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	392/1316	4.50	4.27	4.14	4.13	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	775/1427	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.15	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	836/1447	4.75	4.66	4.69	4.65	4.75
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	190/1434	4.71	4.12	4.10	4.09	4.71

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	626/1387	4.63	4.45	4.46	4.44	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	171/1386	4.88	4.35	4.32	4.30	4.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	339/1380	4.75	4.43	4.32	4.32	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	4.13	593/1193	4.13	4.02	4.02	4.05	4.13

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	999/1172	3.50	4.26	4.15	4.24	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1182	5.00	4.56	4.35	4.42	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.49	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	195/ 800	4.50	4.17	4.06	4.12	4.50

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 6	Required for Majors 6	Graduate 0	Major 5
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1			
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C 0	General 0	Under-grad 8	Non-major 3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	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 0		
				? 0			

Course-Section: SPAN 401 01
 Title Studies In Spanish Lan
 Instructor: Bell,Alan S
 Enrollment: 9
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1391
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	3	3	4.29	839/1447	4.29	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	1	4.00	1053/1447	4.00	4.34	4.27	4.31	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	1175/1241	3.33	4.48	4.33	4.41	3.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	129/1402	4.86	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.86
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	581/1358	4.29	4.26	4.11	4.15	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	196/1316	4.71	4.27	4.14	4.27	4.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	882/1427	4.14	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	701/1434	4.20	4.12	4.10	4.17	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	698/1387	4.57	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	1293/1387	4.14	4.78	4.73	4.76	4.14
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	1047/1386	4.00	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	739/1380	4.43	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.43
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	0	0	2	2	0	3.50	960/1193	3.50	4.02	4.02	4.00	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	1	2	3.60	958/1172	3.60	4.26	4.15	4.25	3.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	996/1182	3.80	4.56	4.35	4.49	3.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	864/1170	4.00	4.41	4.38	4.51	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	612/ 800	3.67	4.17	4.06	4.19	3.67

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421 01
 Title Studies In Hispanic Li
 Instructor: Sinnigen,John H
 Enrollment: 8
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1392
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	0	7	4.75	309/1447	4.75	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	137/1447	4.88	4.34	4.27	4.31	4.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	168/1241	4.88	4.48	4.33	4.41	4.88
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	358/1402	4.63	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1358	5.00	4.26	4.11	4.15	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	166/1316	4.75	4.27	4.14	4.27	4.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	200/1427	4.75	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1447	5.00	4.66	4.69	4.72	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	117/1434	4.80	4.12	4.10	4.17	4.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	245/1387	4.88	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.88
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1387	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.76	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	316/1386	4.75	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	193/1380	4.88	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	1	5	4.25	478/1193	4.25	4.02	4.02	4.00	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	339/1172	4.57	4.26	4.15	4.25	4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	508/1182	4.57	4.56	4.35	4.49	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	538/1170	4.57	4.41	4.38	4.51	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 800	4.17	4.17	4.06	4.19	4.17

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 472 01
 Title Topics In Latn Amer Ci
 Instructor: Poggio,Sara Z
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2010

Page 1393
 JUN 28, 2010
 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	2	1	5	4.38	752/1447	4.38	4.31	4.31	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	853/1447	4.25	4.34	4.27	4.31	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1241	5.00	4.48	4.33	4.41	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	358/1402	4.63	4.36	4.24	4.34	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	485/1358	4.38	4.26	4.11	4.15	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	4.57	322/1316	4.57	4.27	4.14	4.27	4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	3	4	4.25	775/1427	4.25	4.21	4.19	4.20	4.25
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	1175/1447	4.38	4.66	4.69	4.72	4.38
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	2	0	3.67	1150/1434	3.67	4.12	4.10	4.17	3.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	490/1387	4.71	4.45	4.46	4.48	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	6	4.71	919/1387	4.71	4.78	4.73	4.76	4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	719/1386	4.43	4.35	4.32	4.34	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	858/1380	4.29	4.43	4.32	4.34	4.29
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	1	0	1	0	4	4.00	652/1193	4.00	4.02	4.02	4.00	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	4.33	521/1172	4.33	4.26	4.15	4.25	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	979/1182	3.83	4.56	4.35	4.49	3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	576/1170	4.50	4.41	4.38	4.51	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	2	4	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	742/ 800	3.00	4.17	4.06	4.19	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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