

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: SCHUSTERHERR, R
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1405
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	4.00	1092/1504	3.77	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1052/1503	3.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1290	4.15	4.32	4.28	4.19	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	4.37	4.22	4.21	4.11	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	745/1421	3.64	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1365	4.02	4.11	4.08	3.96	5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	4.18	4.20	4.16	4.13	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1483	3.69	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1165/1425	4.04	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1013/1418	3.64	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1416	4.12	4.34	4.26	4.21	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: SCHUSTERHERR, R
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1406
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	3	8	10	15	3.79	1248/1504	3.77	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.79
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	1	2	17	16	4.16	946/1503	3.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.16
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	4	12	18	4.08	906/1290	4.15	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.08
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	5	16	16	4.18	867/1453	4.37	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.18
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	8	4	6	7	13	3.34	1203/1421	3.64	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.34
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	6	10	14	3.86	928/1365	4.02	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	4	11	20	4.24	784/1485	4.18	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.24
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	37	4.97	197/1504	4.97	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.97
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	1	2	8	15	7	3.76	1123/1483	3.69	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	4	3	12	20	4.23	1050/1425	4.04	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.23
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	2	9	28	4.67	967/1426	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	3	3	6	12	15	3.85	1123/1418	3.64	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.85
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	3	3	14	16	3.95	1071/1416	4.12	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	6	5	4	7	10	7	3.30	997/1199	3.39	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	3	5	2	12	3.91	804/1312	3.71	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	16	0	1	0	1	4	17	4.57	529/1303	4.38	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	16	0	1	2	0	5	15	4.35	732/1299	4.04	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.35
4. Were special techniques successful	16	4	2	1	4	4	8	3.79	501/ 758	3.91	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.79
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	37	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	37	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	37	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	38	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	37	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	37	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	37	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	35	0	2	0	0	2	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	35	1	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	35	1	0	0	2	0	1	3.67	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	35	2	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: SCHUSTERHERR, R
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 39

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1406
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	14	Required for Majors	25	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	11	2.00-2.99	8	C	6	General	3	Under-grad	39	Non-major	10
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	9	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	2						
				I	0	Other	8				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1407
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	7	4	10	3.65	1306/1504	3.77	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	5	5	8	5	3.27	1379/1503	3.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	3	5	4	8	6	3.35	1191/1290	4.15	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.35
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	2	6	11	6	3.84	1142/1453	4.37	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.84
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	3	8	8	3.62	1049/1421	3.64	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	6	3	12	4	3.46	1172/1365	4.02	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.46
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	4	3	6	10	3.62	1242/1485	4.18	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	23	4.92	525/1504	4.97	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	4	9	6	2	3.29	1319/1483	3.69	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	6	3	9	7	3.68	1274/1425	4.04	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.68
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	3	3	6	13	4.16	1296/1426	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.16
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	7	4	2	8	4	2.92	1349/1418	3.64	4.29	4.25	4.20	2.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	6	4	7	7	3.52	1241/1416	4.12	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.52
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	4	4	6	6	5	3.16	1027/1199	3.39	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.16
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	2	7	3	4	4	3.05	1140/1312	3.71	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.05
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	5	8	6	3.95	951/1303	4.38	4.39	4.24	3.93	3.95
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	1	3	7	3	5	3.42	1133/1299	4.04	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.42
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	1	2	4	5	5	3.65	542/ 758	3.91	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.65
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	24	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	24	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	24	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	25	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	25	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	25	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful

25 0 0 1 0 0 0 2.00 ****/ 36 **** 4.38 4.60 4.48 ****

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1407
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A	9	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	2	B	10						
56-83	12	2.00-2.99	5	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	26	Non-major	16
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1408
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	9	6	7	3.64	1309/1504	3.77	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	9	6	7	3.60	1272/1503	3.76	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	11	10	4.16	853/1290	4.15	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.16
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	2	0	1	2	5	14	4.45	517/1453	4.37	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	1	3	6	7	6	3.61	1056/1421	3.64	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.61
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	13	5	3.76	996/1365	4.02	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.76
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	3	5	8	8	3.88	1104/1485	4.18	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.88
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/1504	4.97	4.68	4.69	4.66	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	2	1	3	10	5	3.71	1147/1483	3.69	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.71
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	2	2	9	12	4.24	1050/1425	4.04	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.24
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	1	8	15	4.48	1141/1426	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.48
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	2	2	12	7	3.80	1141/1418	3.64	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	3	5	13	4.00	1029/1416	4.12	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	2	5	9	3.71	840/1199	3.39	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.71
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	1	3	5	12	4.18	638/1312	3.71	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.18
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	3	2	17	4.64	478/1303	4.38	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	5	4	13	4.36	714/1299	4.04	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.36
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	1	4	3	12	4.30	286/ 758	3.91	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.30
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	3	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	1	0	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	1	0	0	0	2	3.67	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	22	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	23	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	23	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I
 Instructor: MORENILLA, LAUR
 Enrollment: 32
 Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1408
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	17	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	25	Non-major	7
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	6	D	1						
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				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: SCHELL, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1409
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	3	12	4.39	725/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.39
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	2	15	4.72	248/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	15	4.72	280/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	440/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	4	3	9	4.12	669/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.12
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5	10	4.39	441/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.39
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	4	11	4.33	670/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	778/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	115/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.81
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	285/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	171/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	16	4.83	221/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	3	1	0	5	2	7	3.93	714/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.93
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	0	1	13	4.67	255/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	237/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.87
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	4	4	0	1	0	2	7	4.50	185/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0101
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: SCHELL, ANTHONY
 Enrollment: 29
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1409
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	6	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	13
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0201
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARYA
 Enrollment: 30
 Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1410
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	8	3	3.85	1224/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.85
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	678/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	6	4	3.92	1005/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.92
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1083/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	2	4	2	4	3.67	1017/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	5	3	4	3.77	996/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.77
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	3.77	1170/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.77
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	4.85	760/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	850/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	0	0	4	7	4.08	1139/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.08
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	926/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.69
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	3	4	5	3.92	1081/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	7	5	4.15	953/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.15
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	5	1	0	2	2	3	3.75	820/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.75

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	5	4	4.00	716/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	710/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	768/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	521/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.70

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	13	Non-major	2
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	6	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	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0301
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: AREVALOGUERRERO
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1411
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	12	3	4.06	1065/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.06
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	495/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	3	9	4.25	783/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	4.25	775/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.25
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	2	5	6	4.07	698/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	748/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	670/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	0	8	2	4.20	700/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	0	14	4.87	239/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.87
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	13	4.80	738/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	4	9	4.47	630/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.47
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	446/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	1	1	2	3	4	3.73	835/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.73
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	343/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.54
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	497/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.62
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	494/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.62
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	297/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.27
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	5
84-150	1	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	7				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0401
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1412
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	3	7	8	4.28	864/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	8	10	4.56	437/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	8	4.22	809/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.22
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	935/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	827/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.94
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	9	4.29	536/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	2	11	4.29	716/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	10	7	4.41	1164/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.41
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	2	0	0	2	8	3	4.08	810/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.08
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	760/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	0	16	4.88	549/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.88
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	669/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	498/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.63
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	4	0	2	3	7	3.56	898/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.56
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	3	1	8	4.42	454/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	450/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	273/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	132/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.67

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A	1	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	11						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	4	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0501
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1413
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	5	3	12	4.24	914/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	5	8	8	4.14	954/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	12	8	4.33	711/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	6	11	4.29	741/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	5	3	4	5	3.39	1184/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.39
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	3	4	8	5	3.75	1003/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.75
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	2	4	6	6	3.74	1188/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.74
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	1	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	394/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	543/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	818/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.47
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	773/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	939/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	3	7	9	4.32	821/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.32
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	0	2	8	2	4	3.50	919/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	1	6	7	4.27	585/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.27
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	607/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.47
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	3	5	7	4.27	792/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.27
4. Were special techniques successful	6	3	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	185/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0501
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1413
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	7	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	4				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARYA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1414
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	1	1	5	5	3	3.53	1343/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.53
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	1	1	8	3	1	3.14	1400/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	1	3	4	6	3.87	1038/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.87
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	3	5	3	3.40	1333/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	5	3	4	1	2.80	1360/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	2.80
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	5	3	4	2	3.21	1259/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	2	3	3	4	3	3.20	1359/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	1	0	0	14	4.80	830/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	9	1	2	3.14	1358/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	3	7	3	1	3.00	1367/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	1073/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	3	7	2	3	3.33	1295/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	3	3	2	5	3.50	1248/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	9	1	3	1	0	1	2.50	1138/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	814/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.90
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	450/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	768/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	580/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.50
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.24	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.01	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.01	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.64	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	3.88	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	3.83	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	3.63	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.60	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.00	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	5.00	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.52	****

2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	35	****	4.43	4.49	4.65	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.48	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	4.92	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARYA
 Enrollment: 25
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1414
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons	Type	Majors			
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	3						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	3	Under-grad	16	Non-major	7
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	3						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0701
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: DEANGULO, SANTI
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1415
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	1	3	3	8	3.82	1234/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	3.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	4	0	3	6	5	3.44	1331/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	3.44
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	2	8	3.67	1109/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	4	2	3	6	3.41	1327/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.41
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	1	3	4	4	3	3.33	1207/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	1	5	6	3	3.41	1196/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	3.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	2	4	6	4	3.44	1300/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4.44	1138/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	1	3	8	2	3.60	1197/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.60
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	2	0	7	6	3.94	1205/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	1	7	7	4.25	1268/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.25
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	1	2	6	5	3.69	1193/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	2	2	3	3	6	3.56	1228/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	3	2	3	2	4	3.14	1032/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	3	1	4	2	5	3.33	1070/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	563/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	1	6	1	7	3.93	973/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.93
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	501/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.79
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	17	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0801
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: PETERSON, MARYA
 Enrollment: 28
 Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1416
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	6	1	4	4	2	2.71	1486/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	2.71
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	3	4	6	3	1	2.71	1469/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	2.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	1	7	4	2	3.19	1221/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	5	6	1	3.19	1380/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	3.19
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	7	3	4	2	0	2.06	1409/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	2.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	3	9	2	0	2.69	1335/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	2.69
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	8	3	0	2.80	1419/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	2.80
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	1	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	460/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	1	1	6	6	0	3.21	1337/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.21
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	3	6	5	0	3.00	1367/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	5	5	4	3.73	1368/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	3.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	2	4	6	3	0	2.67	1379/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	2.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	6	5	2	3.19	1306/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	3.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	6	5	0	4	1	0	2.10	1180/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.10
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	0	5	3	4	3.19	1112/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.19
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	2	0	2	3	9	4.06	896/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.06
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	2	0	2	6	6	3.88	1008/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	1	3	6	2	2	3.07	675/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	3.07

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	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	6	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	6
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	2						
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	6				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0901
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: DE LOS RIOS, CA
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1417
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	624/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.45
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	707/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	574/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.45
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	0	1	8	4.60	331/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.60
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	4.00	745/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	654/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	3	5	4.18	842/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.18
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	1130/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.45
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	457/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	971/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	1212/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.38
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	578/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	574/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	0	2	1	2	3.14	1032/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	3.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	255/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	1	0	0	8	4.67	450/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	445/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	169/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.56
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	3.90	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.07	****
Seminar														
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.43	****

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	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	11	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 1001
 Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1418
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	2	0	2	7	4.27	864/1504	3.96	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	4	4	4.00	1052/1503	4.00	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	3	5	4.09	898/1290	4.07	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.09
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	5	4.27	752/1453	3.99	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.27
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	4.09	685/1421	3.55	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.09
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	4	5	4.18	654/1365	3.79	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.18
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	2	3	3	3.70	1206/1485	3.78	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	812/1504	4.74	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.82
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	2	3.89	1009/1483	3.97	4.07	4.06	3.97	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	1002/1425	4.14	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.30
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	1050/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	1	4	3.89	1106/1418	3.99	4.29	4.25	4.20	3.89
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	921/1416	4.16	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	1	1	3	4	4.11	593/1199	3.35	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	465/1312	4.14	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.40
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	675/1303	4.53	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.44	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	6	2	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.06	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0101
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH
 Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1419
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	0	3	1	5	11	4.20	962/1504	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.20
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	2	0	7	11	4.35	722/1503	4.44	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	507/1290	4.56	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	9	9	4.30	718/1453	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.30
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	633/1421	4.06	4.08	4.00	3.91	4.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	2	8	9	4.37	462/1365	4.26	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.37
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	2	1	3	3	10	3.95	1047/1485	4.21	4.20	4.16	4.13	3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	394/1504	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	1	1	1	8	6	4.00	850/1483	4.37	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	1	1	4	13	4.53	760/1425	4.43	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	525/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	2	0	2	4	11	4.16	939/1418	4.27	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.16
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	352/1416	4.73	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.74
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	5	1	1	1	3	7	4.08	610/1199	3.27	3.95	3.97	3.82	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	297/1312	4.05	4.12	4.00	3.69	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	157/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.93
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	523/1299	4.54	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.57
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	75/ 758	4.42	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.85

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	1	B	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	6	C	8	General	3	Under-grad	22	Non-major	5
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	1						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201
 Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH
 Instructor: RELUZCO, ALBERT
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1420
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	416/1504	4.40	4.24	4.27	4.13	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	472/1503	4.44	4.22	4.20	4.16	4.52
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	14	4.62	400/1290	4.56	4.32	4.28	4.19	4.62
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	486/1453	4.39	4.22	4.21	4.11	4.48
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	8	7	3.95	804/1421	4.06	4.08	4.00	3.91	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	10	7	4.14	690/1365	4.26	4.11	4.08	3.96	4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	3	5	13	4.48	495/1485	4.21	4.20	4.16	4.13	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	830/1504	4.88	4.68	4.69	4.66	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	161/1483	4.37	4.07	4.06	3.97	4.73
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	8	10	4.33	971/1425	4.43	4.41	4.41	4.36	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	251/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.56	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	3	7	11	4.38	727/1418	4.27	4.29	4.25	4.20	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	380/1416	4.73	4.34	4.26	4.21	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	8	4	3	4	0	2	2.46	1144/1199	3.27	3.95	3.97	3.82	2.46
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	2	1	2	3	4	3.50	1011/1312	4.05	4.12	4.00	3.69	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	1	0	1	1	9	4.42	663/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	3.93	4.42
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	570/1299	4.54	4.34	4.25	3.94	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	10	5	0	0	2	3	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.42	4.05	4.01	3.80	4.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	9						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	6	C	5	General	2	Under-grad	22	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1421
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	5	6	4.00	1092/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	460/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	8	4.40	642/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	7	5	4.07	968/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	4	6	2	3.33	1207/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	2	4	6	2	3.40	1201/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	830/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	460/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	1	4	8	4.54	314/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.54
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	748/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.53
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	1104/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.53
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	539/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	4	8	4.20	921/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.20
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	10	2	1	1	0	1	2.40	1153/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	2.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	1	1	3	0	4	3.56	993/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	737/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	1	0	4	0	4	3.67	1078/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	3.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	4	0	0	5	0	0	3.00	680/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.00

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	15	Non-major	3
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	2						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: STOLLEMCALISTER
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1422
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	763/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	3	12	4.53	472/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.53
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	488/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	418/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	1	0	0	3	1	12	4.56	276/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	4	1	12	4.47	333/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.47
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	1	1	13	4.41	577/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	6	11	4.65	999/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.65
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	518/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.35
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	3	2	11	4.50	784/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	1081/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.56
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	2	2	11	4.44	669/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	2	1	2	11	4.38	776/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.38
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	1	2	4	8	4.27	487/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	215/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	478/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	474/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.64
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	0	3	7	4.45	214/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.45

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	5	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	1	B	7						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	6	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0301
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: STOLLEMCALISTER
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1423
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA	Frequencies					Mean	Instructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
			1	2	3	4	5							
General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	3	11	4.44	654/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	692/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	8	4.38	671/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	547/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	660/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	9	4.44	383/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	4	10	4.38	625/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.38
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	1087/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	445/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.42
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	634/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.63
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	825/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	501/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.56
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	10	4.56	564/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	6	1	5	3.57	894/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.57
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	5	6	4.42	454/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	518/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.58
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	570/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	1	0	1	6	4	4.00	387/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.00
Laboratory														
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	16	Non-major	9
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0401
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: RELUZCO, ALBERT
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1424
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	4	7	10	4.29	851/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	15	4.71	258/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	201/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.81
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	12	4.52	418/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.52
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	12	4.55	283/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.55
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	1	15	4.38	441/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	5	15	4.62	339/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	7	14	4.67	983/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	0	6	12	4.53	322/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	525/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.70
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	20	5.00	1/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	4	13	4.45	656/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.45
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	407/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.70
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	5	2	2	1	6	3	3.43	955/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.43
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	2	5	4.11	682/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.11
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	0	0	8	4.56	535/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	445/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	12	0	1	0	2	1	5	4.00	387/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	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	16	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	6
84-150	8	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0501
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1425
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	549/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	618/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	440/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	8	4.50	440/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	7	4.14	642/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	603/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	240/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	385/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	649/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.62
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	808/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	342/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	407/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.69
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	1	0	1	0	2	3.50	919/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	632/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	833/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	834/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	1	0	3	3.80	496/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.80

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	3
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0601
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1426
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	0	5	8	4.43	669/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.43
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	1	2	4	6	4.15	946/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.15
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	1	1	3	8	4.38	661/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	1	0	1	4	7	4.23	798/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.23
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	429/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	1	5	6	4.23	603/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	4	4	4	3.85	1122/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.85
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	635/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	0	5	7	4.31	1002/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	825/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	848/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	945/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	0	2	3	2	3.63	876/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.63
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	530/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	268/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	504/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.60
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	132/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.67
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors				
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 2	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	B 2						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	C 5	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	2
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	D 1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
			P 0						
			I 0	Other	4				
			? 0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0701
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: SIMORANGKIR, MO
 Enrollment: 23
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1427
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	4	3	7	2	2	2.72	1484/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	2.72
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	6	4	2	1	2.33	1492/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	2.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	4	1	7	4	3.39	1180/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	3.39
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	2	0	4	5	5	2	3.31	1352/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	3.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	5	3	3	2	3	2	2.85	1350/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	2.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	4	5	4	3	2	2.67	1337/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	2.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	5	4	4	3.22	1354/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	5	3	4	0	1	2.15	1464/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	2.15
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	9	1	6	0	2	2.17	1413/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	2.17
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	4	5	3	5	3.39	1391/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	3.39
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	8	4	3	2	1	2.11	1409/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	2.11
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	11	2	1	2	2	2.00	1401/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	2.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	15	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	****/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	****
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	7	0	5	1	2	1	2	2.45	1254/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	2.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	6	0	2	1	2	2.36	1254/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	2.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	3	2	2	1	3	2.91	1214/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	2.91
4. Were special techniques successful	7	8	2	0	0	0	1	2.33	****/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	****
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	1	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 233	****	4.07	4.09	4.30	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	1	0	1	1	0	0	2.50	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	1	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	17	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						

Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough
				P	0			responses to be significant
				I	0	Other	5	
				?	0			

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0801
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1428
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	131/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.91
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	164/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.82
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	378/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	101/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.91
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	2	7	4.36	449/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.36
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	205/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	319/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	657/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	5	6	4.55	306/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.55
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	331/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	303/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	142/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.91
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	3	2	5	4.20	542/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.20
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	233/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	114/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	4	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	12	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: RELUZCO, ALBERT
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1429
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	327/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	138/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.85
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	201/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	194/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	170/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	15	4.70	169/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.70
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	3	15	4.65	300/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.65
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	743/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.85
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	143/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.76
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	15	4.60	665/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	301/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	191/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	209/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.84
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	0	1	2	1	5	4.11	593/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	444/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	13	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	5.00
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 244	****	4.12	4.09	4.24	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 227	****	4.49	4.40	4.58	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 225	****	4.40	4.23	4.52	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 207	****	4.22	4.09	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.22	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.50	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.21	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.24	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 58	****	3.98	4.43	4.41	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 56	****	4.12	4.23	4.24	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	4.68	4.65	4.51	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 47	****	4.32	4.29	4.65	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.28	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	4.28	4.53	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	4.43	4.49	4.50	****

3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	36	****	4.38	4.60	4.13	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	20	****	5.00	4.24	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/	16	****	5.00	4.51	5.00	****

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: RELUZCO, ALBERT
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1429
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B	11						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	20	Non-major	4
84-150	9	3.00-3.49	6	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	4				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: NASH, LYLE
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1430
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	7	10	4.32	813/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	7	7	4.00	1052/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	5	11	4.26	775/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.26
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	2	6	9	4.05	974/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.05
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	7	4	3.63	1036/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.63
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	10	6	4.05	754/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.05
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	8	8	4.16	878/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	720/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.18
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	4	4	8	4.06	1147/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.06
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	2	5	9	4.24	1276/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	0	2	7	7	4.12	972/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.12
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	0	6	10	4.41	740/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	8	1	0	3	2	2	3.50	919/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	663/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	652/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	0	1	3	0	3	3.71	1065/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	3.71
4. Were special techniques successful	12	2	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	328/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	4.20

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	9	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	5
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MITCHELL, BETTY
 Enrollment: 24
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1431
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	1	0	3	1	5	6	2	3.18	1430/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.18
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	3	4	2	7	1	2.94	1430/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	2.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	1	11	1	3.47	1161/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	5	3	5	1	2.76	1437/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	2.76
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	1	2	1	5	5	3	3.38	1189/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	6	5	1	2.88	1318/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	2.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	6	1	7	3	0	2.41	1463/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	2.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	1	0	0	3	13	4.59	1041/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.59
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	3	3	4	4	0	2.64	1436/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	2.64
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	2	2	4	4	4	3.38	1330/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	2	1	5	4	3	3.33	1395/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	3.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	3	1	4	5	2	3.13	1321/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.13
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	4	1	3	5	2	3.00	1324/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	9	3	2	2	0	0	1.86	1186/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	1.86
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	3	2	4	4	1	2.86	1193/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	2.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	2	4	1	2	5	3.29	1162/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	3.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	6	2	2	1	3	2.50	1248/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	2.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	10	2	1	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	2	A	3	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	8	1.00-1.99	0	B	10						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	4
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	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	1				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MITCHELL, BETTY
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1432
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	1	2	5	5	3.86	1219/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	0	5	8	4.36	722/1503	4.17	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	2	9	4.43	615/1290	4.34	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	5	6	4.14	901/1453	4.18	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.14
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	0	2	5	4	3.69	997/1421	3.98	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	3	3	4	3.54	1138/1365	3.97	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.54
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	339/1485	4.15	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.62
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	879/1504	4.82	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	1	1	4	3	1	3.20	1340/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	888/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.42
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	1232/1426	4.47	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	0	2	4	4	3.91	1098/1418	4.14	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.91
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1092/1416	4.15	4.34	4.26	4.24	3.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	2	0	1	0	1	2.50	1138/1199	3.36	3.95	3.97	3.95	2.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	1	3	2	3	3.50	1011/1312	3.98	4.12	4.00	3.98	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	0	3	0	6	4.00	910/1303	4.27	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	3	1	6	4.30	768/1299	4.13	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.30
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	518/ 758	4.15	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.71

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	10
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 26
 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1433
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	2	4	10	4.22	927/1504	3.61	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	1	5	5	6	3.78	1197/1503	3.52	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.78
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	4	11	4.53	488/1290	3.96	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	729/1453	3.61	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	5	8	4.18	614/1421	3.62	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.18
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	472/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.35
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	0	1	3	7	6	4.06	964/1485	3.71	4.20	4.16	4.15	4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1147/1504	4.65	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	481/1483	3.80	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	4	0	0	1	1	5	8	4.33	971/1425	3.94	4.41	4.41	4.40	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5	0	0	0	1	0	13	4.86	620/1426	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	4	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	993/1418	3.70	4.29	4.25	4.22	4.07
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	1	0	0	4	10	4.47	675/1416	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.47
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	3	1	1	0	4	6	4.08	607/1199	3.44	3.95	3.97	3.95	4.08
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	559/1312	3.59	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	507/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	415/1299	4.29	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.70
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	471/ 758	3.45	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.90

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A	5	Required for Majors	3	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	0	General	7	Under-grad	19	Non-major	6
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	5	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	4				
				?	3						

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0201
 Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I
 Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1434
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	5	1	3.00	1453/1504	3.61	4.24	4.27	4.26	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	3	6	5	1	3.27	1379/1503	3.52	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.27
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	5	7	1	3.40	1175/1290	3.96	4.32	4.28	4.27	3.40
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	3	4	0	5	2	2.93	1420/1453	3.61	4.22	4.21	4.20	2.93
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	1	6	2	3.07	1294/1421	3.62	4.08	4.00	3.90	3.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	3	1	6	2	3.21	1259/1365	3.78	4.11	4.08	4.00	3.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	3	3	4	3	3.36	1325/1485	3.71	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.36
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	743/1504	4.65	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.86
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	2	3	4	0	3.22	1334/1483	3.80	4.07	4.06	4.02	3.22
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	3	2	6	2	3.54	1302/1425	3.94	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.54
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	7	5	4.31	1248/1426	4.58	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.31
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	4	5	1	3.33	1295/1418	3.70	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	2	2	6	1	3.33	1281/1416	3.90	4.34	4.26	4.24	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	2	3	1	2	3	1	2.80	1110/1199	3.44	3.95	3.97	3.95	2.80
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	3	0	3	1	2	2.89	1188/1312	3.59	4.12	4.00	3.98	2.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	815/1303	4.41	4.39	4.24	4.23	4.22
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	4	2	3	3.89	1004/1299	4.29	4.34	4.25	4.21	3.89
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	2	2	2	1	3.00	680/ 758	3.45	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202H 0101
 Title INTERMED SPAN II HONR
 Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI
 Enrollment: 4
 Questionnaires: 4

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1435
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.26	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	3.75	1207/1503	3.75	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.75
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	783/1290	4.25	4.32	4.28	4.27	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	440/1453	4.50	4.22	4.21	4.20	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	548/1421	4.25	4.08	4.00	3.90	4.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.00	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	1387/1485	3.00	4.20	4.16	4.15	3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4.25	1274/1504	4.25	4.68	4.69	4.68	4.25
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	850/1483	4.00	4.07	4.06	4.02	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	3.00	1367/1425	3.00	4.41	4.41	4.40	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	1295/1418	3.33	4.29	4.25	4.22	3.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.24	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3.33	987/1199	3.33	3.95	3.97	3.95	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	255/1312	4.67	4.12	4.00	3.98	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.23	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.34	4.25	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	680/ 758	3.00	4.05	4.01	3.89	3.00

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	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	2	Under-grad	4	Non-major	0
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	1				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: AREVALOGUERRERO
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1436
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	2	4	4.00	1092/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	1150/1503	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.22	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	671/1290	4.52	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.38
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	0	7	4.63	310/1453	4.48	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	439/1421	4.47	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	922/1365	4.13	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.88
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	3.75	1176/1485	3.94	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	4.71	940/1504	4.25	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	0	2	2	3.80	1093/1483	4.21	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.80
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	1	6	4.38	930/1425	4.38	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	848/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.25
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	3	4.00	1029/1416	4.44	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	0	1	1	4	4.00	636/1199	4.07	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	283/1312	4.65	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.63
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	796/1303	4.63	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.25
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	293/ 758	4.39	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.29

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0201
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH I
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 12
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1437
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	8	4.89	146/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.89
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	312/1503	4.27	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	344/1290	4.52	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	680/1453	4.48	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	4.56	283/1421	4.47	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	0	6	4.38	451/1365	4.13	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.38
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	1	1	2	4	4.13	914/1485	3.94	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	1464/1504	4.25	4.68	4.69	4.65	3.78
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	242/1483	4.21	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.63
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	930/1425	4.38	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.38
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	0	7	4.75	261/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	175/1416	4.44	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	574/1199	4.07	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.14
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	255/1312	4.65	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	4.63	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	185/ 758	4.39	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0101
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II
 Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT
 Enrollment: 18
 Questionnaires: 3

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1438
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	4.33	788/1504	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	751/1503	4.35	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	344/1290	4.65	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	270/1453	4.44	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	212/1421	4.44	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	187/1365	4.48	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	990/1485	4.21	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	1487/1504	4.13	4.68	4.69	4.65	3.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	543/1483	4.25	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	1165/1425	4.17	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1426	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	772/1418	4.42	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	4.00	1029/1416	4.04	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3.33	987/1199	3.79	3.95	3.97	4.02	3.33
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1312	4.44	4.12	4.00	4.09	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1303	4.89	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1299	4.72	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/ 758	4.61	4.05	4.01	4.00	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201
 Title ADVANCED SPANISH II
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST
 Enrollment: 15
 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1439
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	1	0	3	4	6	4.00	1092/1504	4.17	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	722/1503	4.35	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	367/1290	4.65	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	0	2	3	8	4.21	821/1453	4.44	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.21
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	1	3	8	4.21	579/1421	4.44	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	0	3	9	4.29	547/1365	4.48	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	4.43	563/1485	4.21	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	525/1504	4.13	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	4	5	4.17	731/1483	4.25	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	0	5	6	4.33	971/1425	4.17	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	967/1426	4.83	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	6	6	4.50	578/1418	4.42	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1001/1416	4.04	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	495/1199	3.79	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	1	0	2	2	4	3.89	826/1312	4.44	4.12	4.00	4.09	3.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	333/1303	4.89	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.78
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	1	0	2	6	4.44	634/1299	4.72	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.44
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	315/ 758	4.61	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.22

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	B	1						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	2
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	0						

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1440
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	639/1504	4.44	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	437/1503	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	230/1290	4.78	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	4	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	571/1421	4.22	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	614/1365	4.22	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	3	0	2	3	3.33	1330/1485	3.33	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	983/1504	4.67	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	0	6	4.50	784/1425	4.50	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	426/1418	4.63	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	324/1416	4.75	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	780/1199	3.83	3.95	3.97	4.02	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	148/1312	4.83	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1303	5.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.30	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	185/ 758	4.50	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.50

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101
 Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 10
 Questionnaires: 7

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1441
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	3	4.14	1010/1504	4.14	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.14
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	495/1503	4.50	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	615/1290	4.43	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	1148/1453	3.83	4.22	4.21	4.23	3.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	524/1421	4.29	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	4	0	2	3.67	1065/1365	3.67	4.11	4.08	4.08	3.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	3.86	1116/1485	3.86	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.86
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1047/1504	4.57	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	1	3	1	3.50	1233/1483	3.50	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	876/1425	4.43	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	5	4.57	1073/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	818/1418	4.29	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14	961/1416	4.14	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	1	3	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	651/1312	4.17	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	563/1303	4.50	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	855/1299	4.17	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.17
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	2	0	2	4.00	387/ 758	4.00	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.00

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101
 Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU
 Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST
 Enrollment: 20
 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1442
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	0	6	12	4.67	357/1504	4.67	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	5	12	4.56	437/1503	4.56	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.56
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	180/1290	4.83	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.83
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	4.67	270/1453	4.67	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	176/1421	4.72	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.72
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	6	9	4.28	558/1365	4.28	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.28
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4	12	4.56	402/1485	4.56	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.56
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	394/1504	4.94	4.68	4.69	4.65	4.94
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	7	8	4.44	421/1483	4.44	4.07	4.06	4.08	4.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	510/1425	4.71	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.71
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	1	15	4.82	690/1426	4.82	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	475/1418	4.59	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.59
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	564/1416	4.56	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	2	0	8	7	4.18	555/1199	4.18	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.18
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	310/1312	4.58	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.58
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	1	1	1	2	6	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	376/ 758	4.09	4.05	4.01	4.00	4.09
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 39	****	4.61	4.44	4.47	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades	Reasons	Type	Majors						
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	13	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	5						
56-83	6	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	18	Non-major	0
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	8	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant			
				P	0						
				I	0	Other	17				
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 309 0101
 Title BUSINESS SPANISH
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1443
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	2	0	3	3	7	3.87	1214/1504	3.87	4.24	4.27	4.27	3.87
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	2	2	3	5	3	3.33	1365/1503	3.33	4.22	4.20	4.22	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	2	3	8	4.13	873/1290	4.13	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	844/1453	4.20	4.22	4.21	4.23	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	3	0	3	8	4.14	642/1421	4.14	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	5	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	2	0	1	1	2	6	4	3.79	1158/1485	3.79	4.20	4.16	4.17	3.79
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	1	2	0	5	2	4	3.46	1250/1483	3.46	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.46
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	1	0	3	6	4	3.86	1234/1425	3.86	4.41	4.41	4.43	3.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	1	0	0	2	11	4.57	1073/1426	4.57	4.72	4.69	4.71	4.57
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	1	2	4	3	4	3.50	1250/1418	3.50	4.29	4.25	4.26	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	5	4	4	3.71	1184/1416	3.71	4.34	4.26	4.27	3.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	5	3	1	2	2	2	2.90	1098/1199	2.90	3.95	3.97	4.02	2.90
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	1	0	2	3	1	3.43	1043/1312	3.43	4.12	4.00	4.09	3.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	1	1	0	2	4	3.88	1004/1303	3.88	4.39	4.24	4.27	3.88
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	1	1	1	2	2	3.43	1133/1299	3.43	4.34	4.25	4.30	3.43
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	1	0	2	2	2	3.57	563/ 758	3.57	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.57

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 311 0101
 Title INTRO TO SPANISH LIT
 Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN
 Enrollment: 21
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1444
 JUN 14, 2005
 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	1	2	2	7	4.25	889/1504	4.25	4.24	4.27	4.27	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	3	7	4.25	848/1503	4.25	4.22	4.20	4.22	4.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	783/1290	4.25	4.32	4.28	4.31	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	1	3	0	2	5	3.64	1241/1453	3.64	4.22	4.21	4.23	3.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	158/1421	4.75	4.08	4.00	4.01	4.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	3	2	6	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.08	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	455/1485	4.50	4.20	4.16	4.17	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.65	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	2	0	4	3	3.89	1009/1483	3.89	4.07	4.06	4.08	3.89
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	179/1425	4.91	4.41	4.41	4.43	4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.71	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	0	9	4.64	414/1418	4.64	4.29	4.25	4.26	4.64
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	2	8	4.45	688/1416	4.45	4.34	4.26	4.27	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	1	0	2	3	5	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	4.02	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	111/1312	4.91	4.12	4.00	4.09	4.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	288/1303	4.82	4.39	4.24	4.27	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	1	0	0	1	9	4.55	543/1299	4.55	4.34	4.25	4.30	4.55
4. Were special techniques successful	1	3	0	3	3	0	2	3.13	670/ 758	3.13	4.05	4.01	4.00	3.13

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 401 0101
 Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN
 Instructor: BELL, ALAN S
 Enrollment: 13
 Questionnaires: 9

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1445
 JUN 14, 2005
 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						Rank	

General														
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	927/1504	4.22	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.22
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	7	4.56	459/1290	4.56	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.56
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	194/1453	4.75	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	571/1421	4.22	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	260/1365	4.56	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.56
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	536/1485	4.44	4.20	4.16	4.14	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	493/1483	4.38	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1057/1425	4.22	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.22
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	549/1426	4.89	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	656/1418	4.44	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.44
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	985/1416	4.11	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.11
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	4.11	593/1199	4.11	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.11
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	330/1312	4.56	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	450/1303	4.67	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	333/1299	4.78	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	2	4	3	4.11	369/ 758	4.11	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.11

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421 0101
 Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI
 Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1446
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	2	4	6	4.33	788/1504	4.33	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	751/1503	4.33	4.22	4.20	4.18	4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	8	3	4.17	853/1290	4.17	4.32	4.28	4.32	4.17
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	680/1453	4.33	4.22	4.21	4.22	4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	4.83	115/1421	4.83	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	672/1365	4.17	4.11	4.08	4.09	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	0	2	4	1	4	3.64	1234/1485	3.64	4.20	4.16	4.14	3.64
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.73	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	4.20	700/1483	4.20	4.07	4.06	4.11	4.20

Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	4.33	971/1425	4.33	4.41	4.41	4.38	4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	451/1426	4.92	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	578/1418	4.50	4.29	4.25	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	740/1416	4.42	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	561/1199	4.17	3.95	3.97	4.05	4.17

Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	530/1312	4.33	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4.75	356/1303	4.75	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	273/1299	4.83	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	7	5	4.42	237/ 758	4.42	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.42

Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 76	****	4.60	4.61	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 70	****	4.54	4.35	4.63	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 67	****	4.32	4.34	4.34	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 76	****	4.41	4.44	4.51	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 73	****	4.17	4.17	4.29	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101
 Title TOPICS IN LATIN AMER CI
 Instructor: POGGIO, SARA
 Enrollment: 17
 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1447
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	1	3	6	4.08	1056/1504	4.08	4.24	4.27	4.33	4.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	1	3.50	1304/1503	3.50	4.22	4.20	4.18	3.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	2	1	0	4	3	2	3.50	1155/1290	3.50	4.32	4.28	4.32	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	1	0	3	2	4	3.80	1168/1453	3.80	4.22	4.21	4.22	3.80
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	2	3	6	4.17	623/1421	4.17	4.08	4.00	4.02	4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	3	1	6	3.83	947/1365	3.83	4.11	4.08	4.09	3.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	1	2	2	4	1	1	2.70	1436/1485	2.70	4.20	4.16	4.14	2.70
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	1006/1504	4.64	4.68	4.69	4.73	4.64
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	1	0	1	4	1	3.57	1207/1483	3.57	4.07	4.06	4.11	3.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	3	4	2	3.45	1318/1425	3.45	4.41	4.41	4.38	3.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	502/1426	4.91	4.72	4.69	4.72	4.91
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	4	5	1	3.55	1240/1418	3.55	4.29	4.25	4.25	3.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	997/1416	4.09	4.34	4.26	4.26	4.09
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	5	3	2	3.70	845/1199	3.70	3.95	3.97	4.05	3.70
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	364/1312	4.50	4.12	4.00	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	1	3	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.34	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	445/1299	4.67	4.34	4.25	4.38	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	328/ 758	4.20	4.05	4.01	4.17	4.20

Frequency Distribution

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

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

University of Maryland
 Baltimore County
 Spring 2005

Page 1448
 JUN 14, 2005
 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	0	4.00	1092/1504	4.00	4.24	4.27	4.44	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1503	5.00	4.22	4.20	4.28	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	937/1290	4.00	4.32	4.28	4.36	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1453	5.00	4.22	4.21	4.34	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1421	5.00	4.08	4.00	4.27	5.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	782/1365	4.00	4.11	4.08	4.35	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1485	5.00	4.20	4.16	4.24	5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1504	5.00	4.68	4.69	4.79	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1425	5.00	4.41	4.41	4.51	5.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1426	5.00	4.72	4.69	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1418	5.00	4.29	4.25	4.36	5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1029/1416	4.00	4.34	4.26	4.38	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	636/1199	4.00	3.95	3.97	4.04	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	716/1312	4.00	4.12	4.00	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	910/1303	4.00	4.39	4.24	4.58	4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1299	5.00	4.34	4.25	4.56	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 758	5.00	4.05	4.01	4.24	5.00

Frequency Distribution

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