Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: PEREZ-REYNA

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 23

Spring 2006

Page 1373 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

| | | | Fre | eauei | ncies | 3 | | Ins | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|--------|----|-----|-------|-------|----|----------|------|----------------------|--------------|------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | _ | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 6 | | 1366/1481 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 3.48 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 8 | | 1216/1481 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 3.74 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 9 | | 1073/1249 | 4.19 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 3.70 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 8 | | 1291/1424 | | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 3.43 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 6 | | 1228/1396 | 3.50 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.18 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 3.78 | 968/1342 | | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.78 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 6 | | 1315/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.35 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 5 | | 1339/1480 | 4.53 | 4.64 | 4.68 | | 4.05 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 2 | 3.50 | 1223/1450 | 3.87 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 3.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 10 | 4.00 | 1152/1409 | 4.21 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 13 | | 1153/1407 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.45 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 9 | | 1196/1399 | 4.07 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 3.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 10 | 4.00 | 1017/1400 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 8 | 6 | 3.80 | 760/1179 | 3.66 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 3.80 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | 2 | 0 | ^ | 0 | -1 | _ | 11 | 4 20 | F27/1060 | 4 10 | 4 10 | 4 05 | 2 77 | 4 20 |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 4.30 | 537/1262 | 4.12 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 4.30 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 15 14 | 4.60 | 509/1259 571/1256 | 4.55 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.29 4.30 | 4.06 4.08 | 4.60 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 3.88 | 492/ 788 | | 4.34 | | 3.80 | 3.88 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | _ | 3 | 9 | 3.00 | 492/ /00 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.95 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.20 | *** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.02 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.17 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3.67 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | | ****/ 68 | **** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.80 | *** |
| The second secon | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.44 | *** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 5.00 | *** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | 3.68 | 4.26 | **** | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.50 | 4.42 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.48 | *** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.42 | *** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.63 | *** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 34 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.67 | *** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.50 | 4.82 | 4.58 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: PEREZ-REYNA

Enrollment: 32

Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1373 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: PEREZ-REYNA

Enrollment: 29

Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1374 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | equei | ncie | s | | Ins | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|------------------------|----|-----|-------|------|----|----|------|------------------------|--------|--------------|--------------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 13 | 4.33 | 749/1481 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 14 | 4.43 | 632/1481 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.43 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 4.48 | 535/1249 | 4.19 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 4.48 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 8 | 4.14 | 863/1424 | 3.94 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 4.14 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 9 | 3.62 | 1018/1396 | 3.50 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.62 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 4.05 | 731/1342 | 3.86 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 4.05 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 15 | 4.52 | 436/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.52 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 12 | 7 | 4.14 | 1295/1480 | 4.53 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 4.14 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 8 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 8 | 4.00 | 836/1450 | 3.87 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 4.14 | 1098/1409 | 4.21 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.14 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 20 | 4.90 | 500/1407 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.90 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | - | 15 | 4.29 | 801/1399 | 4.07 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 4.55 | 541/1400 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.27 | | 4.55 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 3.78 | 780/1179 | 3.66 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 3.78 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4.20 | 610/1262 | 4.12 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 4.20 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 12 | 4.67 | 451/1259 | 4.55 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.47 | 614/1256 | | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.47 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.80 | 89/ 788 | | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | |
| - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory | 1.0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | ^ | 0 | 1 | 2 00 | ****/ 046 | **** | 1 00 | 4 00 | 2 02 | **** |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 19 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 246 ****/ 249 | **** | 4.26 4.08 | 4.20 4.11 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 242 | | 4.45 | 4.11 | | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 20 | U | U | U | U | U | 1 | 5.00 | / 242 | | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.17 | **** |
| Frequ | Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 9 | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 14 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 5 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: GRANENA

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 26

Title

Spring 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1375 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----------|----|-----|-------|-------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 12 | | 1024/1481 | | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 4.08 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 7 | 9 | | 1154/1481 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 3.85 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 12 | 7 | 3.88 | 988/1249 | 4.19 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 3.88 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 9 | | 1181/1424 | | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 3.76 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 7 | | 1054/1396 | 3.50 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.55 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 9 | | 1039/1342 | 3.86 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.67 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 10 | 4.00 | 961/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | 4.92 | 561/1480 | 4.53 | 4.64 | 4.68 | | 4.92 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 3.74 | 1115/1450 | 3.87 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 3.74 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 11 | 4 16 | 1086/1409 | 4.21 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.16 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 18 | | 1030/1407 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.60 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 10 | | 1077/1399 | 4.07 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 3.92 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 14 | 4.29 | 836/1400 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.29 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 3 | | 1029/1179 | 3.66 | 3.94 | 3.96 | | 3.14 |
| 5. Dia addiovibuai ecciniiques ciniance your underseanding | 2 | 2 | - | 2 | O | , | , | 3.11 | 1023/11/3 | 3.00 | 3.51 | 3.70 | 3.03 | 3.11 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 3.76 | 882/1262 | 4.12 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 3.76 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 15 | 4.24 | 796/1259 | 4.55 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.24 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 11 | 4.19 | 809/1256 | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.19 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 3.70 | 552/ 788 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.70 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.95 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 23 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.02 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 22 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 1 = 1 | **** |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 69 | *** | | | 4.54 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 4.44 | 4.10 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 23 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.50 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.24 4.19 | 4.44 | 4.17 | *** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 68 | **** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.80 | **** |
| J. Were criteria for grading made crear | 23 | U | U | 2 | U | U | | 3.00 | , 00 | | 3.90 | 3.92 | 3.00 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 41 | **** | 3.68 | 4.26 | **** | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.50 | 4.42 | **** | **** |
| 1 | | - | • | • | - | _ | _ | | , 32 | | | | | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 23 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2.67 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3.67 | ****/ 34 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 23 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.50 | 4.82 | 4.58 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: GRANENA

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1375 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA

Enrollment: 26

Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1376 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|--------|-----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 4.44 | | | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 4.44 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 10 | 4.50 | 517/1481 | 4.13 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 13 | 4.69 | 310/1249 | 4.19 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 10 | 4.44 | - , | 3.94 | 4.27 | | 4.06 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 6 | 3.67 | | 3.50 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 3.94 | | 3.86 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.94 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | 4.38 | 647/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.38 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/1480 | 4.53 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.25 | 630/1450 | 3.87 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 4.25 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | 1 | 0 | ^ | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1.0 | 4 52 | 707/1400 | 4 01 | 1 10 | 4 40 | 1 26 | 4 52 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 0 | 10 | 4.53 | 727/1409 | 4.21 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | - | - | 1 | - | 13 | 4.86 | 614/1407 | 4.70 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.86 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | | 4.40 | 683/1399 | 4.07 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.40 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.60 | 492/1400 | 4.36 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 3.93 | 661/1179 | 3.66 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 3.93 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.21 | 596/1262 | 4.12 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 4.21 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 4.71 | 402/1259 | 4.55 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 4.71 | . , | 4.45 | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.08 | 4.71 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 10 | 4.43 | 209/ 788 | 4.45 | 4.03 | 4.00 | | 4.43 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 2 | U | U | | 4 | _ | 10 | 4.43 | 209/ /00 | 4.20 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 4.43 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 00 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.95 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.42 | | 4.02 | **** |
| J. Were requirements for tab reports creatly specified | | Ü | O | Ü | O | Ü | _ | 3.00 | , 21, | | 1.12 | 1.01 | 1.02 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.17 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 3.98 | | 3.80 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | 3.68 | 4.26 | *** | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.50 | 4.42 | **** | **** |
| - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 34 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.50 | 4.82 | 4.58 | *** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1376 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 5 | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 5 | C | 1 | General | 3 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Title Instructor: PETERSON, M.

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1377 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Title Instructor: NOGUERIA, B

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1378 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | Frequencies I | | | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|--|---------------|----|--------|--------|----|------|--------|--------|-----------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 2 12 | 1380/1481 | 2 72 | 1 26 | 4 20 | 4.14 | 3.43 |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | ∠ 1 | ∠ 3 | 4 | 10 | 2 | | | | | | 4.14 | 3.43 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 10 | 3 | | 1313/1481 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.23 | | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | Τ | 2 | / | 6 | 5 | | 1102/1249 | | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 3.57 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | Τ | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | ./ | 4 | | 1321/1424 | | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 3.32 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 5 | | 1136/1396 | | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.40 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 4 | | 1200/1342 | | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.29 |
| Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 12 | 4.33 | , | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.33 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 19 | 0 | 3.90 | 1420/1480 | 4.33 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 3.90 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 3.89 | 989/1450 | 3.93 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 3.89 |
| Tarkuus | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | 0 | 0 | • | - | | 1.0 | _ | 4 00 | 1150/1400 | 4 00 | 4 46 | 4 40 | 4 26 | 4 00 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | Τ | 4 | 10 | 6 | | 1152/1409 | | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | Τ | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ι. | 5 | 14 | 4.65 | 975/1407 | 4.66 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.65 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 4.14 | 929/1399 | 4.03 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.14 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 11 | 4.33 | 791/1400 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 3.00 | 1041/1179 | 3.35 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 3.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.36 | 487/1262 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 4.36 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 4.79 | 325/1259 | 4.52 | 4.10 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.79 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | Τ. | | 4.79 | 742/1256 | | 4.34 | 4.29 | 4.08 | 4.79 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | U | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | | | | | | | |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 2 | U | 2 | 3 | U | 6 | 3.91 | 487/ 788 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.91 |

| Credits | Earned | Cum. GPA | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | | |
|---------|--------|-----------|----------|----------|---------|---------------------|------|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 2 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 5 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 8 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 21 | Non-major | 8 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 5 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI

Enrollment: 30

RIBEYRO, CLAUDI Spring 2006

JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1379

Questionnaires: 24

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

| | | | Fre | equei | ncie | s | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|------|----|-----|-------|------|--------|----|------|-----------------------|--------------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 3.88 | 1180/1481 | 3.73 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 3.88 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 8 | | 1000/1481 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 11 | 4.29 | 710/1249 | 3.97 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 7 | 10 | 4.09 | 918/1424 | 3.94 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 3.67 | 985/1396 | 3.49 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.67 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 3.70 | 1023/1342 | 3.74 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.70 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 15 | 4.35 | 683/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.35 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 1 | | 1339/1480 | 4.33 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 4.04 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 6 | 4.13 | 751/1450 | 3.93 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 4.13 |
| T a whoma | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 4.32 | 990/1409 | 4.23 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.32 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 15 | | | | 4.40 | 4.42 | 4.57 | 4.55 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 6 | 11 | 4.18 | 1076/1407 892/1399 | 4.66 4.03 | 4.77 | 4.09 | 4.23 | 4.18 |
| | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 12 | 4.16 | 754/1400 | 4.03 | 4.35 | 4.20 | 4.19 | 4.16 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | | 4 | 2 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3.11 | 1035/1179 | 3.35 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 3.11 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.25 | 570/1262 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 4.25 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 4.25 | 783/1259 | 4.52 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 4.00 | 901/1256 | 4.35 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3.69 | 555/ 788 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.69 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.95 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.02 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.17 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 68 | **** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.80 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | , , , | | | | | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | 3.68 | 4.26 | **** | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.50 | 4.42 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 34 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.50 | 4.82 | 4.58 | **** |
| J. Here effect chough proceeds for all the seddenes | ر ہے | U | J | J | U | U | | 5.00 | / 24 | | 1.50 | 1.02 | 1.50 | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1379 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: PETERSON, M

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 13

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1380 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | |
|-------------|--|---|--------|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| IR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3.54 | 1347/1481 | 3.73 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 3.54 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.85 | 1154/1481 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 3.85 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3.85 | 1005/1249 | 3.97 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 3.85 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 3.92 | 1061/1424 | 3.94 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 3.92 |
| 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2.83 | 1337/1396 | 3.49 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 2.83 |
| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3.50 | 1115/1342 | 3.74 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.50 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3.69 | 1187/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.69 |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | 1079/1480 | 4.33 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 4.45 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 4.00 | 836/1450 | 3.93 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 4.00 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 4.23 | 1043/1409 | 4.23 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.23 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 9 | 4.62 | 1019/1407 | 4.66 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.62 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.15 | 920/1399 | 4.03 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.15 |
| 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 4.33 | 791/1400 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.33 |
| 1 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3.50 | 894/1179 | 3.35 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 3.50 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3.88 | 816/1262 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 3.88 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | | , | | | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.88 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 4.50 | 571/1256 | 4.35 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.50 |
| 5 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3.71 | 548/ 788 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.71 |
| | 00000000000000000000000000000000000000 | 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | R NA 1 | R NA 1 2 0 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 4 1 0 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 0 0 5 0 0 0 1 0 1 0 1 1 6 2 0 | R NA 1 2 3 0 0 0 0 2 5 0 0 0 1 4 0 0 0 0 0 4 0 1 4 1 2 0 1 1 0 5 0 0 0 1 5 1 1 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 1 2 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1 2 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 | R NA 1 2 3 4 0 0 0 0 2 5 3 0 0 0 1 4 4 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 0 0 0 0 4 6 0 1 4 1 2 3 0 1 1 0 5 4 1 1 0 0 1 4 1 1 0 0 1 4 5 0 0 0 1 2 4 0 1 0 1 0 5 1 6 2 0 0 1 5 0 0 0 2 0 5 0 0 0 2 0 1 5 0 0 0 2 0 | R NA 1 2 3 4 5 0 0 0 0 2 5 3 3 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 0 0 0 0 4 6 3 0 1 4 1 2 3 2 0 1 1 0 5 4 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 4 3 1 1 0 0 1 4 6 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 0 0 0 1 3 9 0 0 0 1 3 9 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 0 1 0 1 0 5 6 1 6 2 0 0 1 3 | R NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean 0 0 0 0 2 5 3 3 3.54 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 3.85 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 3.85 0 0 0 0 0 4 6 3 3.92 0 1 4 1 2 3 2 2.83 0 1 1 0 5 4 2 3.50 0 0 0 1 5 4 3 3.69 1 1 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 5 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 0 1 0 1 0 5 6 4.33 1 6 2 0 0 1 3 3.50 5 0 0 2 1 1 4 3.88 5 0 0 0 0 2 0 6 4.50 | R NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank 0 0 0 0 2 5 3 3 3.54 1347/1481 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 3.85 1154/1481 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 3.85 1005/1249 0 0 0 0 0 4 6 3 3.92 1061/1424 0 1 4 1 2 3 2 2.83 1337/1396 0 1 1 0 5 4 2 3.50 1115/1342 0 0 0 1 5 4 3 3.69 1187/1459 1 1 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 1079/1480 5 0 0 0 1 5 6 4.23 1043/1409 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 920/1399 0 1 0 1 0 5 6 4.33 791/1400 1 6 2 0 0 1 3 3.50 894/1179 | R NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean 0 0 0 2 5 3 3 3.54 1347/1481 3.73 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 3.85 1154/1481 3.96 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 3.85 1005/1249 3.97 0 0 0 0 0 4 6 3 3.92 1061/1424 3.94 0 1 4 1 2 3 2 2.83 1337/1396 3.49 0 1 1 0 5 4 2 3.50 1115/1342 3.74 0 0 0 1 5 4 3 3.69 1187/1459 4.06 1 1 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 1079/1480 4.33 5 0 0 0 3 2 3 4.00 836/1450 3.93 0 0 0 1 5 6 4.23 1043/1409 4.23 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.66 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 920/1399 4.03 0 1 0 1 0 5 6 4.33 791/1400 4.21 1 6 2 0 0 1 3 3.50 894/1179 3.35 | R NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean 0 0 0 0 2 5 3 3 3.54 1347/1481 3.73 4.26 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 3.85 1154/1481 3.96 4.26 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 3.85 1005/1249 3.97 4.37 0 0 0 0 0 4 6 3 3.92 1061/1424 3.94 4.27 0 1 4 1 2 3 2 2.83 1337/1396 3.49 4.07 0 1 1 0 5 4 2 3.50 1115/1342 3.74 4.12 0 0 0 0 1 5 4 3 3.69 1187/1459 4.06 4.19 1 1 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 1079/1480 4.33 4.64 5 0 0 0 3 2 3 4.00 836/1450 3.93 4.10 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 1043/1409 4.23 4.46 0 0 0 0 1 3 9 4.62 1019/1407 4.66 4.77 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 920/1399 4.03 4.30 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 5 6 4.33 791/1400 4.21 4.35 1 6 2 0 0 1 3 3.50 894/1179 3.35 3.94 | R NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean 0 0 0 0 2 5 3 3 3.54 1347/1481 3.73 4.26 4.29 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 3.85 1154/1481 3.96 4.26 4.23 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 3.85 1005/1249 3.97 4.37 4.27 0 0 0 0 0 4 6 3 3.92 1061/1424 3.94 4.27 4.21 0 1 4 1 2 3 2 2.83 1337/1396 3.49 4.07 3.98 0 1 1 0 5 4 2 3.50 1115/1342 3.74 4.12 4.07 0 0 0 1 5 4 3 3.69 1187/1459 4.06 4.19 4.16 1 1 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 1079/1480 4.33 4.64 4.68 5 0 0 0 3 2 3 4.00 836/1450 3.93 4.10 4.09 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 920/1399 4.03 4.30 4.26 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 5 6 4.33 791/1400 4.21 4.35 4.27 1 6 2 0 0 1 3 3.50 894/1179 3.35 3.94 3.96 | R NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 0 0 0 0 2 5 3 3 3.54 1347/1481 3.73 4.26 4.29 4.14 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 3.85 1154/1481 3.96 4.26 4.23 4.18 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 3.85 1005/1249 3.97 4.37 4.27 4.14 0 0 0 0 0 4 6 3 3.92 1061/1424 3.94 4.27 4.21 4.06 0 1 4 1 2 3 2 2.83 1337/1396 3.49 4.07 3.98 3.89 0 1 1 0 5 4 2 3.50 1115/1342 3.74 4.12 4.07 3.88 0 0 0 1 5 4 3 3.69 1187/1459 4.06 4.19 4.16 4.17 1 1 0 0 1 4 6 4.45 1079/1480 4.33 4.64 4.68 4.64 5 0 0 0 1 3 2 3 4.00 836/1450 3.93 4.10 4.09 3.97 0 0 0 1 1 5 6 4.23 1043/1409 4.23 4.46 4.42 4.36 0 0 0 0 1 2 4 6 4.15 920/1399 4.03 4.30 4.26 4.23 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 5 6 4.33 791/1400 4.21 4.35 4.27 4.19 1 6 2 0 0 1 3 3.50 894/1179 3.35 3.94 3.96 3.85 |

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

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: NOGUUERIA, B

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1381 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | Frequencies Ins | | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect | | | | |
|--|-----------------|----|---|------|---------|--------|------|------|-----------|------|------|------|--------------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | _ | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | _ | | Mean | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 3 | 3.56 | 1341/1481 | 3.73 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 3.56 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 3.89 | 1130/1481 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 3.89 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 3.89 | 988/1249 | 3.97 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 3.89 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 3.88 | 1101/1424 | 3.94 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 3.88 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3.72 | 942/1396 | 3.49 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.72 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 3.88 | 905/1342 | 3.74 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.88 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 11 | 6 | 4.28 | 757/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.28 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 2 | 3.94 | 1391/1480 | 4.33 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 3.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 3.73 | 1115/1450 | 3.93 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 3.73 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | _ | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 7 | | 1137/1409 | 4.23 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.06 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 14 | 4.78 | 785/1407 | 4.66 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.78 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 6 | | 1130/1399 | 4.03 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 3.83 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 8 | 4.17 | 937/1400 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.27 | | 4.17 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2.93 | 1077/1179 | 3.35 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 2.93 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 4.07 | 684/1262 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 4.07 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 4.50 | 588/1259 | 4.52 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.43 | 658/1256 | 4.35 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.43 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | | 3.85 | 503/ 788 | 3.83 | | 4.00 | | 3.85 |
| 4. Were special techniques successiui | 4 | | | U | 5 | | 0 | 3.03 | 303/ 766 | 3.03 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 3.03 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.95 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.02 | *** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | , | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.17 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | E 00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4 00 | **** |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | | | 0 | | 0 | - | 1 | | , | **** | | | 4.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 17 | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 5.00 **** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 41 | | 3.68 | 4.26 | | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.50 | 4.42 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 34 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | _ | | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.50 | | 4.58 | **** |
| The state of the s | | - | - | - | J | Ŭ | _ | | , 51 | | | 02 | | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: NOGUUERIA, B

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1381 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | arned | rned Cum. GPA | | | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|---------------|---|-------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|-------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 6 | Required for Majors | 8 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | С | 4 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 17 | Non-major | 7 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 2 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: SIMORANGKIR

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 23

Spring 2006

Page 1382 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

| Questions | NR | NA | Fre | equei 2 | ncies 3 | 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | tructor Rank | Course Mean | Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | | Sect Mean |
|--|----|----|-----|------------|------------|---|----|--------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------|--------------|
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 8 | 3.70 | 1287/1481 | 3.73 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 3.70 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 4.09 | 967/1481 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.09 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 8 | 3.78 | 1031/1249 | 3.97 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 3.78 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 3.91 | 1074/1424 | 3.94 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 3.91 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 3.70 | 959/1396 | 3.49 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.70 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 7 | 3.90 | 884/1342 | 3.74 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.90 |
| Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 7 | 9 | 4.09 | 919/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.09 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 20 | 4.87 | 756/1480 | | 4.64 | 4.68 | | 4.87 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 4.05 | 808/1450 | 3.93 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 4.05 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 4.00 | 1152/1409 | 4.23 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 4.60 | 1031/1407 | 4.66 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.60 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 9 | | 1096/1399 | 4.03 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 3.90 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | | 1001/1400 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.05 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 3.67 | 840/1179 | 3.35 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 3.67 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 3.71 | 913/1262 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 3.71 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4.25 | 783/1259 | 4.52 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.35 | 711/1256 | 4.35 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.35 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3.67 | 564/ 788 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.67 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.95 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.02 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.17 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 22 | 0 | 0 | U | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.80 | *** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3.00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 41 | *** | 3.68 | 4.26 | **** | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.50 | 4.42 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 34 ****/ 24 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 22 | 0 | U | Τ | U | U | 0 | ∠.00 | ****/ 24 | | 4.50 | 4.82 | 4.58 | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: SIMORANGKIR

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 23

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1382 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits | Earned | ed Cum. GPA | | | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|---------|--------|-------------|---|---|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 5 5 | Required for Majors | 11 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 1 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 1 | C | 9 | General | 5 | Under-grad | 23 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 1 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | ı |
| | | | | P | 1 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 5 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0701 University of Maryland Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

RIBEYRO, CLAUDI

Instructor: Enrollment:

22 Questionnaires: 20 Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1383 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | Expected | d 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 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 5 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 20 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 1 | | | | | | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: SIMMORANG, KIR

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1384 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept. | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----------|----|-----|-------|-------|----|--------|------|----------------------|--------|--------------|------|-------------|------|
| Ouestions | 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 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 3.60 | 1324/1481 | 3.73 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 3.60 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 4.15 | 917/1481 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.15 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 7 | | 1022/1249 | | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 3.80 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 3.75 | 1186/1424 | 3.94 | | 4.21 | 4.06 | 3.75 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 3.11 | 1266/1396 | 3.49 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.11 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 3.65 | 1044/1342 | 3.74 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.65 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 4.10 | 909/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.10 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 4.85 | 770/1480 | 4.33 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 4.85 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 10 | 2 | 4.08 | 797/1450 | 3.93 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 4.08 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.18 | 1080/1409 | 4.23 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.18 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.69 | 941/1407 | 4.66 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.69 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 4.00 | 1002/1399 | 4.03 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.13 | 969/1400 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.13 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3.50 | 894/1179 | 3.35 | 3.94 | 3.96 | | 3.50 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 3.88 | 816/1262 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 3.88 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 4.00 | 895/1259 | 4.52 | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.06 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 10 | 4.25 | 773/1256 | 4.35 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.25 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3.86 | 501/ 788 | | | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.86 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | _ | 4 | U | 3 | ۷ | , | 3.00 | 301/ /66 | 3.03 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 17 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.95 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 217 | *** | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.02 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3.33 | | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.18 | *** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.17 | *** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 17 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | ****/ 68 | *** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.80 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4 00 | **** |
| - | | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | | | , | **** | | | 4.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 17 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 1 | | , - | **** | 4.04 5.00 | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | | ****/ 36 ****/ 41 | **** | | 4.60 | 5.00 *** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 41 ****/ 31 | **** | 3.68 3.50 | 4.26 | **** | ++++ |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 17 | 1 | Τ | U | U | Т | U | 2.50 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.50 | 4.42 | | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3.33 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.48 | *** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.67 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 17 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 17 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 34 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 17 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2.50 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.50 | 4.82 | 4.58 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: SIMMORANG, K

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 20

SIMMORANG, KIR

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1384 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: DELOSRIOS, C.

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1385 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----------|----|-----|-------|-------|----|----|------|-----------|--------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-----------|
| Ouestions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~ | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 4.33 | 749/1481 | 3.73 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 4.33 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 12 | 4.67 | 324/1481 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 13 | 4.61 | 393/1249 | 3.97 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 4.61 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 12 | 4.61 | 326/1424 | 3.94 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 4.61 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.06 | 675/1396 | 3.49 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 4.06 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 10 | 4.39 | 424/1342 | 3.74 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 4.39 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 4.50 | 460/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | | | 1274/1480 | 4.33 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 4.18 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 7 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 4.00 | 836/1450 | 3.93 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 4.00 |
| | - | - | _ | - | _ | - | = | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 4.71 | 500/1409 | 4.23 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 4.82 | 682/1407 | 4.66 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.82 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.71 | 322/1399 | 4.03 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.71 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.76 | 299/1400 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.76 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 3.57 | 870/1179 | 3.35 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 3.57 |
| J. Did addiovisual techniques emmance your understanding | J | 2 | | 2 | - | 2 | , | 3.37 | 0/0/11/9 | 3.33 | 3.94 | 3.90 | 3.03 | 3.37 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 4.42 | 427/1262 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 4.42 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | 294/1259 | 4.52 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.82 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 394/1256 | 4.35 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.73 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4.18 | 324/ 788 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 4.18 |
| 1. Weie special techniques successiul | O | U | _ | U | 2 | _ | , | 4.10 | 324/ /00 | 3.03 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 3.00 | T.10 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 00 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 3.93 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.95 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 217 | **** | | 4.20 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for tab reports clearly specified | Τ0 | U | U | U | U | U | Τ | 5.00 | / 21/ | | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.02 | |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | E 00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.00 | 4.49 | 4.18 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 63 | **** | | | 4.10 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 18 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.24 4.19 | 4.44 4.35 | 4.17 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 68 | **** | | 3.92 | 3.80 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 18 | U | U | U | U | U | Τ | 5.00 | ***/ 68 | | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.80 | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 2 02 | 4 20 | 4.00 | **** |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | | | 0 | - | 1 | | , 55 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 5.00 **** | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 41 | | 3.68 | 4.26 | **** | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.50 | 4.42 | ^ ^ * * | ^ ^ * * |
| Calf Panad | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Self Paced | 1.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ^ | - | F 00 | ++++/ ^4 | 4444 | 4 50 | 4 02 | 4 67 | ++ |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 34 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 24 | ^^^ | 4.50 | 4.82 | 4.58 | * * * * * |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: DELOSRIOS, C.

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1385 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|----|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 3 | Required for Majors | 10 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 7 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 3 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 10 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 1 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | n |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 2 | | | | | | |

ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: DEANGULO

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 18

Title

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1386 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fr | eque: | ncie | s | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-----|----|----|-------|------|----|----|------|-----------|-----------------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4.22 | 883/1481 | 3.73 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 4.22 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 11 | 4.44 | 603/1481 | 3.96 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 11 | 4.39 | 639/1249 | 3.97 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 4.39 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 9 | 4.44 | 509/1424 | 3.94 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 4.44 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 9 | 4.06 | 675/1396 | 3.49 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 4.06 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learne | d 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 9 | 4.11 | 683/1342 | 3.74 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 4.11 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 9 | 4.28 | 757/1459 | 4.06 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.28 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 7 | 4.39 | 1126/1480 | 4.33 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 4.39 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | s 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 4.22 | 662/1450 | 3.93 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 4.22 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 4.67 | 559/1409 | 4.23 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 4.67 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | | 4.78 | 785/1407 | 4.66 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.78 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | | 4.44 | 636/1399 | 4.03 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.44 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | | 4.33 | 791/1400 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 4.33 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 5 | | 3.53 | 883/1179 | | | 3.96 | | 3.53 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.15 | 638/1262 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 4.15 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 358/1259 | 4.52 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.06 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4.62 | 506/1256 | 4.35 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.62 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.85 | 503/ 788 | 3.83 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.85 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 3.93 | *** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 3.95 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.33 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.20 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.02 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.14 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 68 | *** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.80 | **** |
| 7. 11 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Field Work | 1.0 | • | - | _ | _ | 0 | 0 | 1 00 | | ale ale ale ale | 2 00 | 4 20 | 4 00 | **** |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 17 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.44 | |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 41 | **** | 3.68 | 4.26 | **** | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 34 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.67 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4.00 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.50 | 4.82 | 4.58 | **** |

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: DEANGULO

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 18

Spring 2006

Page 1386 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 3 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 12 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 18 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 6 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 6 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 2 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

INT REV ELEM SPANISH

Title Instructor: MORENILLA, L.

Enrollment:

23 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1387 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Ouestions | NR | NA | Fre | eque 2 | ncie 3 | s 4 | 5 | Ins Mean | tructor Rank | | Dept Mean | | | Sect Mean |
|---|-------|-----|------|-----------|-----------|--------|--------|-------------|-----------------|------|--------------|------|------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3.84 | 1199/1481 | 4.07 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.14 | 3.84 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 3 | 3.68 | 1242/1481 | 4.02 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.18 | 3.68 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 8 | 8 | 4.11 | 854/1249 | 3.99 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.14 | 4.11 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 3.94 | 1035/1424 | 4.00 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.06 | 3.94 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 3.69 | 972/1396 | 3.66 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.89 | 3.69 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 7 | 3.94 | , - | 3.88 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 3.88 | 3.94 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 4.16 | 863/1459 | 4.28 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.16 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 5.00 | 1/1480 | 4.76 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.64 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 8 | 0 | 3.44 | 1249/1450 | 3.99 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.97 | 3.44 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 5 | | 1191/1409 | 4.25 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 3.95 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 7 | 10 | | 1253/1407 | 4.60 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.57 | 4.26 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 5 | 4 | | 1206/1399 | 4.13 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 3.63 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 8 | 6 | | 1130/1400 | | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.19 | 3.79 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 2 | 3.33 | 972/1179 | 3.38 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.85 | 3.33 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 17 | 1108/1262 | 3.80 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 3.77 | 3.17 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 7 | 4.08 | | 4.33 | 4.10 | 4.05 | 4.06 | 4.08 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4.00 | 901/1256 | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.08 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.45 | | 4.45 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 4.45 |
| 1. Were special techniques successivi | , | _ | U | U | | - | U | 1.13 | 1977 700 | 1.13 | 4.03 | 1.00 | 3.00 | 1.13 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.54 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.14 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | , | | | | | |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.00 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.44 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 5.00 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | , 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.48 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 18 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.42 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 18 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.63 | **** |
| Freq | iencv | Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | d Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|---------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|-------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 7 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 3 | Required for Majors | 15 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 3 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 13 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 2 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 0 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 2 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be si | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 1 | _ | | - | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201 University of Maryland Title INT REV ELEM SPANISH

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: NASH, L. Enrollment: 27

Questionnaires: 18

Page 1388 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

| | Evaluation | |
|--|------------|--|
| | | |

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

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

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: NASH, L.

Enrollment: 15
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1389 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

| Credits E | Carned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A | 4 | Required for Majors | 7 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 2 | C | 3 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 11 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 6 | | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: GLYNN, DOUG

Enrollment: 20
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1390 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | | | | | Fr | eque | ncies | 3 | | Inst | tructor | Course | e Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|---------|-------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|-------|------|
| | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Did voi | u gain ne | ew insights,ski | | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 6 | 4 06 | 1031/1481 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 4.06 |
| _ | _ | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 5 | | 1082/1481 | | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 3.94 |
| | | uestions reflec | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 5 | | 953/1249 | | | | 4.36 | 3.94 |
| | _ | uations reflect | | - | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 4.00 | | | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| | | | | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | 1149/1396 | | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 3.38 |
| | _ | _ | | o what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 5 | 4.00 | 755/1342 | | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 4.00 |
| | | g system clearl | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 6 | | | 1021/1459 | | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.94 |
| | - | was class cance | | inea | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 15 | 0 | | 1398/1480 | | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 3.94 |
| | _ | | | hing effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 | | | 945/1450 | | 4.10 | | 4.15 | |
| | | 5 | | | _ | | - | _ | _ | - | _ | | , | | | | | |
| | | Lectur | | | | _ | | _ | _ | | _ | | | | | | | |
| | | uctor's lecture | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 4.43 | | | | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.43 |
| | | ctor seem inter | | | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | | 4.64 | | | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.64 |
| | | | | xplained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | | | 1002/1399 | | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.00 |
| | | es contribute to | | - | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | | | 898/1400 | | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | |
| 5. Did aud | diovisual | l techniques en | hance y | our understanding | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3.46 | 914/1179 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 3.46 |
| | | Discus | gion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cla | ass disc | | | what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 4.33 | 507/1262 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.33 |
| | | | | d to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | | 4.67 | , | | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.67 |
| | | | | d open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 4.56 | | | 4.34 | 4.30 | | 4.56 |
| | | echniques succe | | a open arbeabbion | 7 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | | 4.43 | | | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | |
| • | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Labora | - | 1.1.6 | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were yo | ou provid | ded with adequa | te back | ground information | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.32 | *** |
| | | Field ' | Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did fie | eld exper | rience contribu | te to w | hat you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Did you | u clearly | y understand yo | ur eval | uation criteria | 15 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| | | 2.15 | - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did se | lf-paced | Self Self System contribution | | what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.44 | **** |
| | F | 2,222 20112111 | | 7 | | | - | - | _ | - | - | | , | | | | | |
| | | | | Frequ | lency | Dist | rib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 5 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | 1 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 6 | | Red | quir | ed f | or Ma | jor | s l | U | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 | 0 2 | В 8 | | | | _ | | | | | 1 | , . | _ | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | C 1 | | Ger | nera | Τ | | | | 0 | Under-9 | rad 1 | L6 | Non- | -major | 0 | | |
| 84-150 | 0 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 0 | #### - | | | | _ | h |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | _ | respons | es to b | oe sigr | nificar | ıt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Oth | ner | | | | | 5 | | | | | | |
| | | | | 3 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: OSKOZ, A.

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 16

Baltimore County Spring 2006

University of Maryland

Page 1391 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0401
Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Title INTERMEDII Instructor: NASH, L.

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 19

Page 1392 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 4.74 | 316/1481 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 4.74 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 4.53 | 493/1481 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 4.53 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 12 | 4.53 | 479/1249 | 4.47 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.53 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 4.32 | 671/1424 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.32 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 3.74 | 934/1396 | 3.86 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 3.74 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 12 | 4.37 | 444/1342 | 4.10 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 4.37 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 13 | 4.32 | 719/1459 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.32 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 12 | 4.63 | 974/1480 | 4.47 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 4.63 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 4.67 | 217/1450 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.67 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 14 | 4.72 | 466/1409 | 4.51 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.72 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 | 4.89 | 545/1407 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.89 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 14 | 4.67 | 376/1399 | 4.33 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.67 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 16 | 4.78 | 287/1400 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.78 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 9 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 2.89 | 1089/1179 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 2.89 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 4.42 | 427/1262 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.42 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 10 | 4.75 | 358/1259 | 4.61 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 9 | 4.67 | 457/1256 | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 4.67 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.00 | 394/ 788 | 4.28 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.00 |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expecte | ed Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|---------|-----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 4 | Required for Majors | 12 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 14 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | С | 1 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 19 | Non-major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 8 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 5 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 9 | _ | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: COLOMBO

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1393 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0601 University of Maryland Title

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County MESSICK, ROSALI Spring 2006

Ρ

I

0

0

Instructor: Enrollment: 24

Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1394 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

| | | | | | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|----------|-------------|-------------------|----------|---------------------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|--------|----------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | | Questions | ; | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 543 | | General | | 1.1.2 | 1 | 0 | ^ | 0 | 0 | _ | 1.0 | 4 62 | 420 /1 401 | 4 00 | 1 00 | 4 00 | 4 40 | 4 62 |
| | | ew insights, skil | | | Τ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 4.63 | 439/1481 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 4.63 |
| | | ctor make clear | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 0 | 3 | 13 12 | 4.71 4.71 | 274/1481 287/1249 | 4.40 4.47 | 4.26 4.37 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 4.71 4.71 |
| | _ | uestions reflect | | | - | 1 | 0 | - | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.71 | - , | | | | 4.36 | |
| | | uations reflect | | | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 10 | 4.63 | 318/1424 297/1396 | 4.33 | 4.27 4.07 | 4.21 | 3.94 | 4.63 4.50 |
| | | | | what you learned | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 1 | 9 11 | | | | 4.07 | 3.98 4.07 | | |
| | | _ | | to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 5 | | 4.44 | - , - | 4.10 | | | 4.05 4.17 | 4.44 |
| | - | g system clearly | _ | ainea | 1 | - | _ | • | _ | - | 8 | 4.19 | 836/1459 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 4.16 | | 4.19 |
| | - | was class cance | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 8 | | 1044/1480 | 4.47 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 4.50 |
| 9. How t | would you g | grade the overal | .I tead | ching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | Τ | U | 3 | 6 | 7 | 4.06 | 808/1450 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.06 |
| | | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Were | the instri | actor's lectures | nrenared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4.41 | 878/1409 | 4.51 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.41 | |
| | | ctor seem intere | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| | | | | explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.47 | 601/1399 | 4.33 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.78 | 4.47 |
| | | es contribute to | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.65 | 444/1400 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.65 |
| | | | | your understanding | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 2 | Τ. | 7 | 4.56 | 233/1179 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 4.56 |
| 5. DIG 8 | audiovisua. | r teciniiques em | lance y | your understanding | 1 | , | U | U | ۷ | U | , | 4.50 | 233/11/9 | 3.33 | 3.94 | 3.90 | 4.05 | 4.50 |
| | | Discuss | ion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did o | class disc | | | what you learned | 10 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4.29 | 550/1262 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.29 |
| | | | | ed to participate | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 257/1259 | 4.61 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.86 |
| | | - | _ | nd open discussion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 256/1256 | | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 4.86 |
| | | echniques succes | | ia open alboabbion | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 117/ 788 | | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.71 |
| 1 | Special co | Joining account | | | | ŭ | Ü | ŭ | _ | Ü | ŭ | | 11,, ,, | 1.20 | 1.05 | 1.00 | 3.70 | |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | / Dist | rib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | _ | | | | | |
| Credits | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Rea | asons | 5 | | | Туј | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| 00-27 | 1 | A 4 | | Red | quire | ed fo | or Ma | jor | s | 9 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | or | 0 | | |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 4 | | | - | | | - | | | | | | 3 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 6 | C 8 | | Ger | nera: | l | | | | 0 | Under-g | rad 1 | .7 | Non- | -major | 0 |
| 84-150 | 7 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | - | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F 0 | | Ele | ectiv | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | ſh |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Other

8

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0701 Title

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Ρ

I

0

0

1

Instructor: OSKOZ, A.

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Page 1395 Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

5

responses to be significant

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | | | | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--------|------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|-------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|----------|------|----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
| | | | Questions | 5 | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. D | id you | u gain ne | w insights,skil | | om this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 8 | 4.38 | 708/1481 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 4.38 |
| | | | tor make clear | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 10 | 4.56 | 446/1481 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 4.56 |
| 3. D | id the | e exam qu | estions reflect | the e | expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 4.63 | 381/1249 | 4.47 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.63 |
| 4. D | id otl | her evalu | ations reflect | the ex | spected goals | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 8 | 4.33 | 645/1424 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.33 |
| 5. D | id as | signed re | adings contribu | ite to | what you learned | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 3.87 | 831/1396 | 3.86 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 3.87 |
| 6. D | id wr | itten ass | ignments contri | .bute t | to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4.06 | 719/1342 | 4.10 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 4.06 |
| 7. W | las the | e grading | system clearly | expla | ained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 4.38 | 647/1459 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.38 |
| 8. H | Iow mai | ny times | was class cance | elled | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 5.00 | 1/1480 | 4.47 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 5.00 |
| 9. H | low wol | uld you g | rade the overal | .l tead | ching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4.54 | 311/1450 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.54 |
| | | | Lecture | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. W | Jere tl | he instru | prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 13 | 4.80 | 334/1409 | 4.51 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.80 | | |
| 2. D | id the | e instruc | tor seem intere | sted i | n the subject | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 4.80 | 728/1407 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.80 |
| 3. W | as le | cture mat | erial presented | l and e | explained clearly | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 4.73 | 289/1399 | 4.33 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.73 |
| 4. D | id the | e lecture | s contribute to | what | you learned | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 13 | 4.87 | 187/1400 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.87 |
| 5. D | id aud | diovisual | techniques enh | nance y | our understanding | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.10 | 557/1179 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 4.10 |
| | | | Discuss | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. D | id cla | ass discu | ssions contribu | ite to | what you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 4.62 | 289/1262 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.62 |
| 2. W | Jere a | ll studen | ts actively end | courage | ed to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 4.77 | 347/1259 | 4.61 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.77 |
| 3. D | id the | e instruc | tor encourage f | air ar | nd open discussion | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.69 | 428/1256 | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 4.69 |
| 4. W | lere s | pecial te | chniques succes | ssful | - | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 7 | 4.45 | 197/ 788 | 4.28 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.45 |
| | | | | | Frequ | ıency | 7 Dist | trib | ution | ı | | | | | | | | | |
| Cm o d | lits Ea | o wwo d | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Dos | | | | | т | | | | Modera | |
| | IILS E | arnea | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | | sons | | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | ; |
| | 0-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 7 | | | | | | Red | quir | ed fo | or Ma | ajor | s | 8 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | r | 0 |
| 28- | | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 56- | | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | C 2 | | Gei | nera | l | | | | 1 | Under-g | rad 1 | 7 | Non- | major | 4 |
| | 150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gra | ıd. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | ſh |

Other

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: GLYNN, DOUG

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006 Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

Page 1396

| General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. Did 10. Did 11. 16. 4.83 290/1409 4.51 4.66 4.79 4.17 4.07 4.05 4.20 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 4.17 | Ouestions | NR | NA | | reque 2 | | s 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | ructor Rank | | e Dept Mean | UMBC Mean | Level Mean | Sect Mean |
|--|---|-------|-------|-------|------------|------|--------|----|--------------|----------------|------|----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 5. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 6. Did vote revaluations reflect the expected goals 7. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 8. Did sasigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 9. Did sasigned reading system clearly explained 9. Did you gain the system clearly explained 9. Did you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did sasigned reading system clearly explained 9. Did you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 9. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3. Did the instructor encourage fa | Questions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 18 4.90 115/1481 4.40 4.26 4.23 4.29 4.4 1.5 0.00 0 0 0 1 5 10 4 15 4.79 219/1249 4.47 4.37 4.27 4.26 4.4 1.5 0.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 1 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 219/1249 4.47 4.37 4.27 4.26 4.5 bid noter evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 1 2 6 11 4.35 419/1396 3.86 4.07 3.98 3.94 4.5 bid assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 3 1 2 6 11 4.35 419/1396 3.86 4.07 3.98 3.94 4.7 4.8 4.7 4.8 4.7 4.8 4.7 Mas the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 3 1 4 4.5 4.79 175/1459 4.29 4.10 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.7 4.8 4.8 4.9 Many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 1 3 5 4.21 1245/1489 4.27 4.10 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 1 3 5 4.21 1245/1489 4.27 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.8 How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | | | - | • | - | - | | | | | | | | | 4.75 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 3 16 4.75 217/1424 4.33 4.27 4.21 4.28 4.5 Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 1 3 13 4.53 299/1342 4.10 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.16 Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 3 3 13 4.53 299/1342 4.10 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.18 4.18 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.8 4.10 4.10 4.07 4.05 4.18 4.18 4.19 4.10 4.10 4.07 4.05 4.18 4.19 4.10 4.10 4.10 4.07 4.05 4.18 4.10 4.10 4.07 4.05 4.18 4.19 4.10 4.10 4.07 4.05 4.18 4.10 4.10 4.07 4.07 4.08 4.19 4.10 4.10 4.07 4.05 4.18 4.10 4.10 4.07 4.07 4.08 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.10 4.10 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.07 4.0 | | - | - | | - | - | _ | | | -, | | | | | 4.90 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 1 2 6 11 4.35 19/1396 3.86 4.07 3.98 3.94 4. 6. Did written assigned to contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 175/1459 4.29 4.19 4.16 4.17 4. 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 175/1459 4.29 4.19 4.16 4.17 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 5 4.21 1245/1450 4.47 4.64 4.68 4.86 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 131/1450 4.47 4.64 4.68 4.68 4. 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 131/1450 4.71 4.04 4.09 4.15 4. 10 4. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.79 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 0 0 3 3 13 4.53 290/1342 4.10 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.7 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 1 0 0 0 4 15 4.79 175/1459 4.29 4.19 4.16 4.17 4. 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 1 13 5 4.21 1245/1480 4.47 4.64 4.68 4.68 4.69 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 131/1450 4.31 4.10 4.09 4.15 4. 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 16 4.83 290/1409 4.51 4.46 4.42 4.47 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 18 5.00 1/1407 4.74 4.77 4.69 4.78 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 1 0 17 4.89 145/1399 4.33 4.30 4.26 4.29 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 166/1400 4.55 4.35 4.27 4.34 4. 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 5. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 5. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. 5. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. 5. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 *** 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 *** 2. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 *** 3. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.09 4.31 4.32 *** 3. Emina 5. Emina 5. Emina 5. Emina 7. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 *** 5. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 * | <u>.</u> | | - | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.75 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | 4.35 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 1 13 5 4.21 1245/1480 4.47 4.64 4.68 4.68 4.9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 13 5 4.21 1245/1480 4.47 4.64 4.68 4.68 4.9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 1 1 13 6 4.82 131/1450 4.31 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1 | | | _ | - | - | _ | | | | , - | | | | | 4.53 4.79 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0 0 0 0 3 14 4.82 131/1450 4.31 4.10 4.09 4.15 4. Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 16 4.83 290/1409 4.51 4.46 4.42 4.47 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 18 5.00 1/1407 4.74 4.77 4.69 4.78 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 17 4.89 145/1399 4.33 4.30 4.26 4.29 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 16 4.89 166/1400 4.55 4.35 4.27 4.34 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 419/1179 3.55 3.94 3.96 4.05 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.30 4.28 4. 4. Were special techniques successful Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 0 1 1 5.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 *** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 *** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 4.09 4.00 4.07 *** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 *** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 *** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.7 | | - | _ | - | - | - | | | | | | | | | 4.79 |
| Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 16 4.83 290/1409 4.51 4.46 4.42 4.47 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 0 18 5.00 1/1407 4.74 4.77 4.69 4.78 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 17 4.89 146/1399 4.33 4.30 4.26 4.29 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 166/1400 4.55 4.35 4.27 4.34 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 419/1179 3.55 3.94 3.96 4.05 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 294/1259 4.61 4.40 4.29 4.34 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.30 4.28 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 1 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.08 4.01 4.32 ** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 ** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 ** Seminar 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 ** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 3.92 4.30 4.67 ** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.55 4.56 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.55 4.66 ** | - | | | | - | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 1 1 1 1 6 4.83 290/1409 4.51 4.46 4.42 4.47 4. 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 8 5.00 1/1407 4.74 4.77 4.69 4.78 5. 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 17 4.89 145/1339 4.33 4.30 4.26 4.29 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 165/1400 4.55 4.35 4.27 4.34 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 419/1179 3.55 3.94 3.96 4.05 4. 3. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 2. Were all students actively encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 9 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.03 4.28 4. 3. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 4. 5. 4. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. 5. | 7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 5 | U | U | U | U | J | 11 | 1.02 | 131/1430 | 4.51 | 4.10 | 4.00 | 1.13 | 1.02 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 0 18 5.00 1/1407 4.74 4.77 4.69 4.78 5.3 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 17 4.89 145/1399 4.33 4.30 4.26 4.29 4. 5. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 166/1400 4.55 4.35 4.27 4.34 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 419/1179 3.55 3.94 3.96 4.05 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 294/1259 4.61 4.40 4.29 4.34 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.30 4.28 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 2.8 Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 *** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 *** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 4.94 4.35 4.72 *** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 *** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 *** | Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 0 0 0 1 0 17 4.89 145/1399 4.33 4.30 4.26 4.29 4. 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 166/1400 4.55 4.35 4.27 4.34 4. 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 419/1179 3.55 3.94 3.96 4.05 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 294/1259 4.61 4.40 4.29 4.34 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 1 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 ** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 *** 4. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 ** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 3.92 4.30 4.67 ** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 *** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 *** 2. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 *** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 *** | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 16 | 4.83 | 290/1409 | 4.51 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.83 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 0 2 16 4.89 166/1400 4.55 4.35 4.27 4.34 4.5 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 3 0 1 3 1 9 4.29 419/1179 3.55 3.94 3.96 4.05 4. Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 1 2 9 4.82 294/1259 4.61 4.40 4.29 4.34 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.30 4.28 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.30 4.28 4. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 *** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 *** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 4. Autor of the provided with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 *** 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 *** 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 *** 4. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 | | | | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.78 | 5.00 |
| Discussion Dis | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4.89 |
| Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 294/1259 4.61 4.40 4.29 4.34 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.30 4.28 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 ** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 ** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 3.92 4.30 4.67 ** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | - | | - | - | | - | | | | | | | | | 4.89 |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4. 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 294/1259 4.61 4.40 4.29 4.34 4. 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.30 4.28 4. 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 *** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 ** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 ** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 9 | 4.29 | 419/1179 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 4.29 |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9 0 0 0 1 3 7 4.55 325/1262 4.28 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.2 Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 294/1259 4.61 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.3 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.4 4.8 Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 *** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 ** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 ** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9 0 0 0 0 0 2 9 4.82 294/1259 4.61 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.30 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.4 4.4 Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 2.00 Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 *** 4.01 Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 *** 4.10 Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 *** 2.0 Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 *** 2.0 Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 2.0 Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 *** 3.00 Contribute to with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 *** | | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 4.55 | 325/1262 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.55 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0 0 0 1 1 9 4.73 394/1256 4.43 4.34 4.30 4.28 4. 4. Were special techniques successful 9 0 0 1 0 2 8 4.55 166/788 4.28 4.03 4.00 3.98 4. Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 *** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 ** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 *** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 ** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 4.94 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.82 | | | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.82 |
| Laboratory 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 ** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 ** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 ** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 ** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 3.92 4.30 4.67 ** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | | . 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 9 | 4.73 | 394/1256 | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 4.73 |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 ** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 ** Seminar | 4. Were special techniques successful | 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 4.55 | 166/ 788 | 4.28 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.55 |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18 1 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 246 **** 4.26 4.20 4.51 ** 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 ** Seminar | Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 249 **** 4.08 4.11 4.32 ** Seminar 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 5.00 ** 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 ** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 3.92 4.30 4.67 ** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | | 18 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 4.51 | **** |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **** |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | Cominar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ## Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.19 4.35 4.72 ** Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 3.92 4.30 4.67 ** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | | 19 | Λ | Λ | Λ | Ω | Ο | 1 | 5 00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4 66 | 4 49 | 5 00 | **** |
| Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 3.92 4.30 4.67 ** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | | | | | | | | _ | 5.00 | , 00 | | | | | **** |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 59 **** 3.92 4.30 4.67 ** 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3.80 ** 3.90 4.66 ** 4.66 *** | The propositions concretated to what you rearned | | Ū | ŭ | Ü | ŭ | Ü | _ | 3.00 | , 05 | | , | 1.00 | | |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.04 4.00 4.07 ** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | | | _ | | _ | | _ | | | | | | | | |
| Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | | | | | - | | - | _ | | , | | | | | **** |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 55 **** 3.90 4.55 4.44 ** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ***/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 31 **** 4.28 4.75 4.50 ** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 19 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 ****/ 51 **** 4.42 4.65 4.66 ** | 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.44 | *** |
| 3. Were your concacts with the instructor helpful 15 0 0 0 0 1 3.00 / 31 1.12 1.03 1.00 | 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.50 | **** |
| Frequency Distribution | 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.66 | **** |
| | Fre | quenc | y Dis | strik | outio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors | Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade | s | | | Re | ason | ıs | | | Τv | pe | | | Majors | 5 |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| Credits I | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|--------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 9 | Required for Majors | 13 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 6 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 4 | С | 1 | General | 2 | Under-grad | 20 | Non-major | 3 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 5 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |

0

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0901 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County

Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 16

Spring 2006
Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1397 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Frequencies | | | Inst | ructor | Course Dept | | UMBC Level | | Sect | | |
|---|---|---|-------------|---|---|----------------|--------|-------------|-----------|------------|------|------|------|------|
| Questions | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 4.13 | 986/1481 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 4.81 | 176/1481 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 4.81 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 4.80 | 203/1249 | 4.47 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.80 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 10 | 4.60 | 334/1424 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.60 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 9 | 4.27 | 493/1396 | 3.86 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 4.27 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 9 | 4.50 | 303/1342 | 4.10 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 4.50 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 12 | 4.73 | 210/1459 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.73 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 4.40 | 1114/1480 | 4.47 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 4.40 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 5 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 4.50 | 334/1450 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.50 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | ٥ | 4.57 | 682/1409 | 4.51 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.57 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - 1 | 13 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 4.74 | 4.40 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 4.69 | 335/1399 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.09 | 4.76 | 4.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.09 | 299/1400 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.09 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3.90 | 692/1179 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 3.90 |
| 3. Did addiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | 3 | U | | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3.90 | 092/11/9 | 3.33 | 3.34 | 3.90 | 4.05 | 3.90 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 205/1262 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.75 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4.88 | 238/1259 | 4.61 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.88 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 496/1256 | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 4.63 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 145/ 788 | 4.28 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.63 |
| Frequency Distribution | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1398 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Frequencies | | | Instructor | | Course Dept | | UMBC Level | | Sect | | |
|---|--------|----|-------------|---|--------|------------|----|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|------|------|------|------|
| Ouestions | NR | NA | 1 | _ | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | | Mean | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 522/1481 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 4.53 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 4.67 | 324/1481 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 4.67 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 10 | 4.53 | 470/1249 | 4.47 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.53 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 4.47 | 485/1424 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.47 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3.86 | 839/1396 | 3.86 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 3.86 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 4.14 | 649/1342 | 4.10 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 4.14 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 4.00 | 961/1459 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 3.93 | 1398/1480 | 4.47 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 3.93 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 164/1450 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.75 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 10 | 4.63 | 618/1409 | 4.51 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.63 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 4.81 | 705/1407 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.81 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | 10 | 4.50 | | 4.33 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 4.75 | 312/1400 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.75 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4.00 | 590/1179 | | 3.94 | | 4.05 | 4.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 4.58 | 305/1262 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.58 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 358/1259 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.58 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 4.75 | 571/1256 | | | | | |
| | 4 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | | | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 4.50 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | U | U | U | U | 3 | 9 | 4.75 | 105/ 788 | 4.28 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.75 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.32 | **** |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.63 | **** |
| 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 240 | **** | 4.37 | 4.20 | 4.58 | **** |
| 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 217 | **** | 4.42 | 4.04 | 4.28 | **** |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 5.00 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.83 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.00 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.72 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 68 | **** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.55 | **** |
| 5. Were effected for grading made effect | 13 | O | O | O | _ | O | U | 3.00 | , 00 | | 3.70 | 3.72 | 3.33 | |
| Field Work | 1.5 | • | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 | 4 00 | ***** / 50 | ale ale ale ale | 2 00 | 4 20 | 4 65 | **** |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 1 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 59 ****/ 51 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 15 | | | | | - | - | 3.00 | , | | 4.04 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | | , | *** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.64 | **** |
| 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 41 | *** | 3.68 | 4.26 | 4.69 | **** |
| 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 3.50 | 4.42 | 4.80 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.44 | **** |
| 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | ****/ 31 | **** | 4.28 | 4.75 | 4.50 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | , - | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.66 | **** |
| 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 34 | **** | 4.50 | 4.83 | 4.43 | **** |
| 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3.00 | ****/ 24 | **** | 4.50 | 4.82 | 5.00 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor:

Enrollment:

COLOMBO, LAURA

22 Questionnaires: 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1398 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1101

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Title Instructor: MITCHELL, BETTY

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 14

Spring 2006 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1399 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | equei | ncies | 3 | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------|------|------|-------|-------|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|--------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3.50 | 1358/1481 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 3.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | | | 1296/1481 | | 4.26 | 4.23 | | 3.57 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | | | 865/1249 | | 4.37 | 4.27 | | 4.07 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 4.00 | 959/1424 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 3.43 | 1125/1396 | 3.86 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 3.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3.57 | 1084/1342 | 4.10 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 3.57 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 3.86 | 1086/1459 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 6 | 4.43 | 1100/1480 | 4.47 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 4.43 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 3.55 | 1209/1450 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 3.55 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3.71 | 1261/1409 | 4.51 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 3.71 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 9 | 4.14 | 1286/1407 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.14 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3.29 | 1288/1399 | 4.33 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 3.29 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3.79 | 1130/1400 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.79 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2.00 | 1156/1179 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 2.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3.70 | 913/1262 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 3.70 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.30 | 751/1259 | 4.61 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.30 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3.78 | 1035/1256 | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 3.78 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 4 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3.00 | 713/ 788 | 4.28 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 3.00 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 246 | **** | 4.26 | 4.20 | 4.51 | **** |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.32 | |
| 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | ****/ 242 | **** | 4.45 | 4.40 | 4.63 | **** |
| Frequ | iency | Dist | trib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Clum GDA Expected Grades | - | | | | agons | , | | | Тул | 20 | | | Maiors | |

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|--------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 4 | Required for Majors | 9 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 3 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 4 | General | 1 | Under-grad | 14 | Non-major | 4 |
| 84-150 | 1 | 3.00-3.49 | 2 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | gnificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 4 | | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1201 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor: MITCHELL, BETTY

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 19

| Baltimore | County | JUN 1 | 3, 20 | 06 |
|-----------|--------|-------|-------|-----|
| Spring | 2006 | Job I | RBR30 | 129 |

Page 1400

| | | | Fre | יפווחי | ncies | 2 | | Tnet | ructor | Course | Dent | UMBC | T.evre.1 | Sect |
|--|----|-----|-----|--------|-------|---|---|------|-----------|--------|------|------|----------|------|
| Ouestions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | Mean | Rank | | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| Quescions | | INA | | | | | | Mean | Kalik | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 3.39 | 1392/1481 | 4.28 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 3.39 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3.39 | 1366/1481 | 4.40 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 3.39 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 3.82 | 1013/1249 | 4.47 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.36 | 3.82 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 3.83 | 1138/1424 | 4.33 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 3.83 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 1 | 4 | 3.22 | 1210/1396 | 3.86 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 3.22 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 3.47 | 1130/1342 | 4.10 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 3.47 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 6 | 4.18 | 845/1459 | 4.29 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.18 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 9 | 4.50 | 1044/1480 | 4.47 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 4.50 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 6 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 3.23 | 1312/1450 | 4.31 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 3.23 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 12 | 1110/1409 | 4.51 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.13 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 7 | | 1315/1407 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 3.94 |
| g and a second s | 3 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4 | , | | 1189/1399 | 4.74 | 4.77 | 4.09 | 4.78 | 3.69 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 6 | 4.25 | 867/1400 | 4.55 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.29 | 4.25 |
| _ | 3 | 7 | 2 | 1 | Δ | 0 | 0 | | , | | | | | 2.67 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 3 | / | 2 | Τ | 4 | 2 | U | 2.07 | 1114/1179 | 3.55 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 2.07 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 3.73 | 902/1262 | 4.28 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 3.73 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3.91 | 978/1259 | 4.61 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 3.91 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4.00 | 901/1256 | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 3.45 | 627/ 788 | 4.28 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 3.45 |
| - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County

Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1401

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

| Enrollment: | 14 | | | | |
|-----------------|----|---------|--------|------------|---------------|
| Questionnaires: | 10 | Student | Course | Evaluation | Questionnaire |

| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 399/1481 4.26 4.26 4.23 4.29 4.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 142/1249 4.59 4.37 4.27 4.36 4.90 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 178/1424 4.36 4.27 4.21 4.28 4.80 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 5 4.30 459/1396 3.80 4.07 3.98 3.94 4.30 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 303/1342 4.17 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 8 4.60 344/1459 3.73 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.60 | | | | | | | | Fr | | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|--|----------|-------------|-----------|------|--------------------|----------------------|------|-------------------|-------|-------|-------|---|------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | | | Question | s | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 2 7 4.60 399/1481 4.26 4.26 4.23 4.29 4.60 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 142/1249 4.59 4.37 4.27 4.36 4.28 4.80 4.01 dother evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 8 4.80 178/1424 4.36 4.27 4.21 4.28 4.86 5. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 8 4.80 178/1424 4.36 4.27 4.21 4.28 4.86 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 303/1342 4.17 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.56 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 303/1342 4.17 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.55 4.50 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 546/1459 3.73 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.02 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 546/1450 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.33 4.34 4.35 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 4.30 | 1. Did v | zou gain ne | | | m this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 4.40 | 678/1481 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 4.40 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 1 9 4.90 142/1249 4.59 4.37 4.27 4.36 4.90 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | | 7 | | | | | | | 4.60 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 8 8 4.80 178/1424 4.36 4.27 4.21 4.28 4.86 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 5 4.30 459/1396 3.80 4.07 3.98 3.94 4.36 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 303/1342 4.17 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.56 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 8 4.60 344/1459 3.73 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.62 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 546/1450 4.02 4.64 4.68 4.68 4.26 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 546/1450 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.33 2.00 4.00 4.00 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.33 2.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.33 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.34 4.05 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 4.90 | 142/1249 | 4.59 | | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.90 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 3 5 4.30 459/1396 3.80 4.07 3.98 3.94 4.30 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 6 4.50 303/1342 4.17 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.50 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 8 4.60 344/1459 3.73 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.62 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 2 4.20 1260/1480 4.02 4.64 4.68 4.68 4.68 4.20 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 546/1450 4.02 4.64 4.68 4.68 4.20 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 2 4.20 1260/1480 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.33 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.15 4.33 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.15 4.33 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.15 4.33 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.15 4.33 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.15 4.33 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.15 4.34 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.15 4.34 1.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0 | | _ | | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | | 178/1424 | 4.36 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.80 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 6 4.50 303/1342 4.17 4.12 4.07 4.05 4.50 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 2 4.20 1260/1440 4.02 4.10 4.06 4.68 4.68 4.20 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 546/1450 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.33 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 0 2 3 3 3.78 1245/1409 3.89 4.46 4.42 4.47 3.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.78 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.00 1002/1399 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.29 4.00 4.01 4.01 4.02 4.01 4.09 4.02 4.00 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 4.01 | | | | | 1 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.30 | 459/1396 | 3.80 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 4.30 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 2 0 8 4 .6.0 344/1459 3.73 4.19 4.16 4.17 4.60 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 0 8 2 4.20 1260/1480 4.02 4.64 4.68 4.26 4.68 4.26 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 546/1450 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.33 **Lecture** 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 0 1 0 2 3 3 3.78 1245/1409 3.89 4.46 4.42 4.47 3.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.78 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.00 1002/1399 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.29 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 **Discussion** 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 4 4.50 345/1262 4.16 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.55 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.55 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.55 588/1259 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.55 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.55 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.55 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.55 588/1259 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.55 588/1259 4.17 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.55 588/1259 4.17 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 5 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | _ | _ | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 4.50 | 303/1342 | 4.17 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 4.50 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 8 2 4.20 1260/1480 4.02 4.64 4.68 4.26 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 1 4 4 4.33 546/1450 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.33 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 0 2 3 3 3.78 1245/1409 3.89 4.46 4.42 4.47 3.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.78 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.00 1002/1399 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.29 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 312/1400 4.34 4.35 4.27 4.34 4.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 5 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 5 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 5 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 5 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 5 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 5 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.33 723/1256 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful Credits Earned Cum. GPA | | | _ | | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 4.60 | | | 4.19 | | 4.17 | 4.60 |
| How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 4 4 4.33 546/1450 4.02 4.10 4.09 4.15 4.33 | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4.20 | 1260/1480 | 4.02 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 4.20 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 0 2 3 3 3 3.78 1245/1409 3.89 4.46 4.42 4.47 3.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.78 5.00 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.00 1002/1399 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.29 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.00 1002/1399 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.29 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 345/1262 4.16 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.33 723/1256 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 105/ 788 4.48 4.03 4.00 3.98 4.75 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 1 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | | | hing effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 546/1450 | 4.02 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.33 |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 1 0 1 0 2 3 3 3 3.78 1245/1409 3.89 4.46 4.42 4.47 3.78 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.78 5.00 4. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.00 1002/1399 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.29 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.00 1002/1399 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.29 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 345/1262 4.16 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.33 723/1256 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 105/ 788 4.48 4.03 4.00 3.98 4.75 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 1 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 | | | I.ectur | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 1 0 0 0 0 0 9 5.00 1/1407 4.79 4.77 4.69 4.78 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.00 1002/1399 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.29 4.00 4.00 1 1 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 312/1400 4.34 4.35 4.27 4.34 4.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 345/1262 4.16 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.55 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 4.28 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 105/788 4.48 4.03 4.00 3.98 4.75 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 B 4 5 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 5 S6-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 0 F 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 F 0 | 1. Were | the instr | | | prepared | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3.78 | 1245/1409 | 3.89 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 3.78 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 1 1 4 3 4.00 1002/1399 3.92 4.30 4.26 4.29 4.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 312/1400 4.34 4.35 4.27 4.34 4.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Discussion Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 345/1262 4.16 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.50 3.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.0 | | | | | | 1 | - | | - | 0 | | 9 | | | | | | | |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 0 2 6 4.75 312/1400 4.34 4.35 4.27 4.34 4.75 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Did audiovisual techniques contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 1 1 1 4 4.50 345/1262 4.16 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.50 3. Did the instructor encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 | | | | | _ | _ | 0 | | | | - | - | | , - | | | | | |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 0 1 1 5 1 3.75 793/1179 3.61 3.94 3.96 4.05 3.75 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 345/1262 4.16 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.50 3.04 3.06 4.05 3.75 4.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.33 723/1256 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 345/1262 4.16 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.33 723/1256 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 105/ 788 4.48 4.03 4.00 3.98 4.75 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 | | | | | - | | | - | | | 5 | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4 0 0 0 1 1 4 4.50 345/1262 4.16 4.18 4.05 4.11 4.50 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.33 723/1256 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 105/ 788 4.48 4.03 4.00 3.98 4.75 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 | | | Disque | gion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4 0 0 1 0 0 5 4.50 588/1259 4.57 4.40 4.29 4.34 4.50 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.33 723/1256 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 105/ 788 4.48 4.03 4.00 3.98 4.75 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors | 1 Did o | rlace diec | | | what you learned | 4 | Ω | Λ | Λ | 1 | 1 | 4 | 4 50 | 345/1262 | 4 16 | 4 18 | 4 05 | 4 11 | 4 50 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 1 0 0 0 5 4.33 723/1256 4.17 4.34 4.30 4.28 4.33 4. Were special techniques successful 4 2 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 105/ 788 4.48 4.03 4.00 3.98 4.75 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 | | | | | - | 4 | - | | | 0 | 0 | 5 | | | | | | | |
| 4 2 0 0 0 1 3 4.75 105/ 788 4.48 4.03 4.00 3.98 4.75 Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 | | | | | | _ | - | | | - | - | - | | | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 | | | | | a open arbeabsion | _ | - | _ | - | - | - | - | | -, | | | | | |
| Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 5 Required for Majors 4 Graduate 0 Major 0 28-55 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 4 56-83 4 2.00-2.99 1 C 1 General 2 Under-grad 10 Non-major 2 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 | | - | - | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 00-27 | | | | | Frequ | ency | Dist | trib | ution | n | | | | | | | | | |
| 28-55 | Credits | Earned | Cum. GPA | Ĺ | Expected Grades | ades Reasons Type Ma | | | | | | | | Majors | } | | | | |
| 28-55 | 00-27 | 2 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 5 | | Red | quir | ed fo | or Ma | ajors | | 4 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | r r | 0 |
| 56-83 | 28-55 | 0 | | 0 | в 4 | | | - | | | | | | | | | 3 - | | |
| 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 1 #### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 | 56-83 | 4 | | 1 | C 1 | | Gei | nera | 1 | | | | 2 | Under-g | rad 1 | .0 | Non- | major | 2 |
| P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 | | 1 | | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | J | | | | - | |
| P 0 responses to be significant I 0 Other 3 | Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti [.] | ves | | | | 1 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enouc | ıh |
| I 0 Other 3 | | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | _ | |
| | | | | | I 0 | | Ot1 | her | | | | | 3 | - | | 5 | | | |
| | | | | | = * | | | | | | | | - | | | | | | |

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0201

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA

Enrollment: 23

Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1402 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

| | | | Fre | equer | ncie | S | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------|--------|-----|---------|--------|--------|---|------|------------------------|--------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| General | 1 | 0 | 1 | -1 | 0 | _ | 4 | 2 77 | 1040/1401 | 4 00 | 4 06 | 4 00 | 4 40 | 2 77 |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 2 | 2 2 | 5 | 4 | | 1248/1481 | | | 4.29 | 4.40 | 3.77 |
| Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | | | 5 | 5 | | 1094/1481 | 4.26 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 3.93 |
| - | 0 | | 0 | 0 1 | 1 2 | 4 7 | 8 | | 718/1249 | 4.59 | 4.37 | | 4.36 | 4.29 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 4 | | | 1061/1424 1181/1396 | 3.80 | 4.27 4.07 | 4.21 3.98 | 4.28 | 3.92 3.31 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | | | 927/1342 | | 4.07 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 3.85 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 3 | | | 1409/1459 | 3.73 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 2.86 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 | | 1409/1439 | 4.02 | 4.19 | 4.18 | 4.17 | 3.83 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 5 | - | | 1133/1450 | 4.02 | | 4.09 | 4.15 | |
| 7. now would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | U | U | U | _ | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3.71 | 1133/1430 | 4.02 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.13 | 3.71 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4.00 | 1152/1409 | 3.89 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4.57 | 1053/1407 | 4.79 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.78 | 4.57 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.85 | 1125/1399 | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 3.85 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 3.93 | 1074/1400 | 4.34 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 3.93 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3.46 | 914/1179 | 3.61 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.05 | 3.46 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | _ | | _ | _ | _ | _ | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3.82 | 855/1262 | 4.16 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 3.82 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 9 | | 480/1259 | 4.57 | 4.40 | | 4.34 | 4.64 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 4.00 | | 4.17 | | | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 4.20 | 318/ 788 | 4.48 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 4.20 |
| Laboratory | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Were you provided with adequate background information | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 249 | **** | 4.08 | 4.11 | 4.32 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | _ | | | | | | | | | | | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.83 | |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.00 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.72 | |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.55 | **** |
| Field Work | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 59 | **** | 3.92 | 4.30 | 4.67 | **** |
| 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria | 13 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2.00 | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.04 | 4.00 | 4.07 | **** |
| 3. Was the instructor available for consultation | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 36 | **** | 5.00 | 4.60 | 4.64 | **** |
| Self Paced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1.00 | ****/ 55 | **** | 3.90 | 4.55 | 4.44 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | 13 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | ****/ 51 | **** | 4.42 | 4.65 | 4.44 | **** |
| 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful | TO | U | Т | U | U | U | U | 1.00 | | | 4.42 | ±.05 | 4.00 | |
| Frem | en as | Diet | rih | ıt i or | , | | | | | | | | | |

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202H 0101 University of Maryland
Title INTERMED SPAN II HONR Baltimore County
Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI Spring 2006

University of Maryland Page 1403
Baltimore County JUN 13, 2006
Spring 2006 Job IRBR3029

| Enrollment: | 6 | | | |
|-----------------|---|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Questionnaires: | 6 | Student Cour | se Evaluation | Questionnaire |

| | | | | | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Inst | tructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------------|----------|--------------------|---------------------|-------|----------|-------|-------|------|----------|------|-----------|---------|--------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Questions | S | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did vo | ou gain ne | ew insights,ski | | this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 5.00 | 1/1481 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.40 | 5.00 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 162/1481 | 4.83 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.29 | 4.83 |
| | | estions reflect | _ | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 334/1249 | 4.67 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.36 | 4.67 |
| | _ | ations reflect | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 287/1424 | 4.67 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.28 | 4.67 |
| | | | _ | hat you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | | 4.67 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 3.94 | 4.67 |
| 6. Did wr | itten ass | signments contr | ibute to | what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4.67 | 190/1342 | 4.67 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.05 | 4.67 |
| | | g system clearly | | _ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 4.50 | 460/1459 | 4.50 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 4.50 |
| 8. How ma | ny times | was class cance | elled | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4.17 | 1281/1480 | 4.17 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.68 | 4.17 |
| 9. How wo | uld you g | grade the overa | ll teach | ning effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 4.60 | 259/1450 | 4.60 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.15 | 4.60 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 Wara t | ho inatro | Lecture actor's lectures | | ropared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.80 | 334/1409 | 4.80 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 4.80 |
| | | ctor's lecture: | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.42 | 4.47 | 5.00 |
| | | | | plained clearly | | | | | | 4.80 | 212/1399 | 4.80 | 4.77 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.80 | | |
| | | es contribute to | | | 1 0 0 0 0 1 4 | | | | | | 250/1400 | 4.80 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.34 | 4.80 | | |
| | | | _ | our understanding | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 442/1179 | 4.25 | 3.94 | | | 4.25 |
| 5. Did au | luiovisuai | t techniques em | nance yo | our understanding | | | U | U | | | 4 | 4.25 | 442/11/9 | 4.23 | 3.94 | 3.90 | 4.03 | 4.23 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | ass discu | ssions contrib | ute to v | hat you learned | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4.50 | 345/1262 | 4.50 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.11 | 4.50 |
| 2. Were a | ll studer | nts actively end | couraged | l to participate | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5.00 | 1/1259 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did th | e instruc | ctor encourage : | fair and | l open discussion | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4.00 | 901/1256 | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were s | pecial te | echniques succes | ssful | | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3.50 | 604/ 788 | 3.50 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.98 | 3.50 |
| | | | | F | | - D.: | L l la . | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | Freq | uency | Dist | LTID | ıcıor | :1 | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | es Reasons | | | | | | | | Туј | рe | | | Majors | 3 |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 5 | Required for Majors | | | | | | 3 | 0 | Graduat | e | 0 | Majo | r • | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | в 1 | | | _ | | | | | | | | | 3 | | |
| 56-83 | 1 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Gei | nera: | L | | | | 2 | Under-g | rad | 6 | Non- | major | 0 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F 0 | | Ele | ectiv | res | | | | 0 | #### - 1 | Means t | here a | re not | enoug | jh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | | respons | es to b | e sign | ifican | ıt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Otl | her | | | | | 4 | _ | | | | | |
| | | | | ? 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1404 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

| Course-Section: | SPAN 301 0101 | University of Maryland |
|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|
| Title | ADVANCED SPANISH I | Baltimore County |
| Instructor: | AREVALOGUERRERO | Spring 2006 |

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

15

| | | | Fre | - | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|------|------|------|-------|-------|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4.00 | 1069/1481 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 4.25 | 822/1481 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.25 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 498/1249 | 4.50 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.50 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 5 | 4.43 | 533/1424 | 4.43 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.27 | 4.43 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 363/1396 | 4.43 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.00 | 4.43 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 4.00 | 755/1342 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.12 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3.25 | 1337/1459 | 3.25 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.25 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1480 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.65 | 5.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 4.14 | 741/1450 | 4.14 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.10 | 4.14 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4.50 | 762/1409 | 4.50 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.43 | 4.50 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4.13 | 947/1399 | 4.13 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.13 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 4.25 | 867/1400 | 4.25 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.25 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4.67 | 177/1179 | 4.67 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.02 | 4.67 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | _ | | 005/4050 | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 236/1262 | 4.71 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.14 | 4.71 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 4.71 | 402/1259 | 4.71 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.71 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | ./ | 5.00 | 1/1256 | 5.00 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 5.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4.80 | 89/ 788 | 4.80 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.80 |
| Frequ | ency | Dist | ribu | ıtion | า | | | | | | | | | |
| - 1 | - 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201

Title ADVANCED SPANISH II AREVALOGUERRERO

Instructor:

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 17 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1405 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | equer | ncies | 3 | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|----|----|-----|-------|-------|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 4.25 | 844/1481 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.25 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 7 | 1 | | 1082/1481 | 3.94 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 3.94 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3.94 | | 3.94 | 4.20 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 3.94 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 2 | ۵ | 4.31 | 671/1424 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.27 | 4.31 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 3.88 | 823/1396 | 3.88 | 4.27 | 3.98 | 4.27 | 3.88 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 4.19 | 603/1342 | 4.19 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.12 | 4.19 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 1 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 4 | 3 | | 1373/1459 | 3.06 | 4.12 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.06 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 491/1480 | 4.94 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.65 | 4.94 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 4.07 | 797/1450 | 4.07 | 4.10 | 4.09 | | 4.07 |
| J. now would you grade the overall teaching circultationess | J | O | U | O | 2 | , | , | 1.07 | 75771150 | 1.07 | 1.10 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.07 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 8 | 4.31 | 990/1409 | 4.31 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.43 | 4.31 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 15 | 4.94 | 350/1407 | 4.94 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.94 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 5 | 4.06 | 980/1399 | 4.06 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.06 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 7 | 4.13 | 969/1400 | 4.13 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.13 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3.77 | 786/1179 | 3.77 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.02 | 3.77 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4.33 | 507/1262 | 4.33 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.14 | 4.33 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 4.44 | 643/1259 | 4.44 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.44 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.33 | 723/1256 | 4.33 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.33 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 8 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4.14 | 347/ 788 | 4.14 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.14 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Seminar | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | **** |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Τ | 0 | | ****/ 68 | **** | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.70 | **** |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ţ | | ****/ 69 | **** | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.66 | **** |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | | ****/ 63 | **** | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.56 | **** |
| 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Ţ | 0 | | ****/ 69 | *** | 4.19 | 4.35 | 4.48 | **** |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 16 | 0 | 0 | U | Τ | U | U | 3.00 | ****/ 68 | **** | 3.98 | 3.92 | 4.43 | **** |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

Course-Section: SPAN 304 0101 University of Maryland Title SPANISH FOR SPAN SPEAK SCHWARTZ, ANA-M

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1406

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 16

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

| Credits E | arned | Cum. GPA | 1 | Expected | d Grades | Reasons | | Type | | Majors | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 6 | Required for Majors | 6 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 2 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 4 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 3 | C | 2 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 16 | Non-major | 9 |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 3 | F | 0 | Electives | 1 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | 1 |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 3 | - | | | |
| | | | | 2 | Λ | | | | | | |

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101

Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS

1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme $11 \quad 0 \quad 0$

Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN

Enrollment: 17 Ouestionnaires: 12 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1407 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 68 **** 4.66 4.49 4.70 ****

| | | | | Er. | 201121 | ncies | 4 | | Tnat | ructor | Course | Dent | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|----|--|----|----|-----|--------|-------|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| | Ouestions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 4.25 | 844/1481 | 4.25 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.25 |
| 2. | Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3.50 | 1320/1481 | 3.50 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 3.50 |
| 3. | Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4.25 | 742/1249 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.25 |
| 4. | Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 3.75 | 1186/1424 | 3.75 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.27 | 3.75 |
| 5. | Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 4.08 | 655/1396 | 4.08 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.00 | 4.08 |
| 6. | Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3.83 | 934/1342 | 3.83 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.12 | 3.83 |
| 7. | Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 5 | 3.58 | 1233/1459 | 3.58 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.58 |
| 8. | How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 5.00 | 1/1480 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.65 | 5.00 |
| 9. | How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 3.27 | 1301/1450 | 3.27 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.10 | 3.27 |
| | <u>-</u> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| _ | Lecture | | _ | | _ | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| | Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 6 | | 1125/1409 | | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.43 | 4.09 |
| | Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 6 | | 1205/1407 | 4.36 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.36 |
| | Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 5 | | 1002/1399 | | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 4.00 |
| | Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 3.64 | 1193/1400 | 3.64 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.64 |
| 5. | Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4.09 | 560/1179 | 4.09 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.02 | 4.09 |
| | Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 6 | 0 | Λ | Λ | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4.17 | 631/1262 | 4.17 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.14 | 4.17 |
| | Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 6 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4.00 | 895/1259 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.00 |
| | Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 6 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3.17 | 1156/1256 | 3.17 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 3.17 |
| | Were special techniques successful | 6 | 1 | 1 | U | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3.80 | 515/ 788 | | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.80 |
| 4. | were special techniques successful | О | Τ | Т | U | 1 | U | 3 | 3.80 | 313/ /88 | 3.80 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.80 |
| | Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2006

Frequency Distribution

2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 69 **** 4.26 4.53 4.66 **** 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 63 **** 4.24 4.44 4.56 ****

| Credits Ea | arned | Cum. GPA | | Expected | l Grades | Reasons | | Туре | | Majors | |
|------------|-------|-----------|---|----------|----------|---------------------|----|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 3 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 6 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 0 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 2 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 4 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 2 | General | 0 | Under-grad | 12 | Non-major | 0 |
| 84-150 | 4 | 3.00-3.49 | 4 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | ı |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | mificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 10 | _ | | | |
| | | | | 2 | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: SPAN 308 0101 University of Maryland
Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU Baltimore County

Instructor:

POGGIO, SARA

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1408

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | Ouestion | | | MD | NA | Fr 1 | eque: | ncie 3 | s 4 | 5 | Inst Mean | tructor Rank | | Dept Mean | | | |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|---------|-------|-----------|----------|-------|--------------|-----------------|--------|--------------|--------|--------|------|
| | | Question | .s | | INK. | INA | | | | | | меап | Raiik | | Mean | Mean | меан | Mean |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did yo | ou gain ne | ew insights,ski | lls fro | om this course | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 4.23 | 870/1481 | 4.23 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 4.23 |
| | | ctor make clear | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3.69 | 1237/1481 | 3.69 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 3.69 |
| | | uestions reflec | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.31 | 703/1249 | 4.31 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.31 |
| | _ | uations reflect | | _ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 6 | 4.31 | 684/1424 | 4.31 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.27 | 4.31 |
| | | | | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 11 | 4.77 | 131/1396 | 4.77 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.00 | 4.77 |
| | _ | _ | | o what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.15 | 638/1342 | 4.15 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.12 | 4.15 |
| | | g system clearl | | - | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 6 | | 1148/1459 | | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.77 |
| | | was class cand | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 3 | 4.23 | 1230/1480 | 4.23 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.65 | 4.23 |
| | - | | | hing effectiveness | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 2 | | 959/1450 | | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.10 | 3.92 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 77 | | Lectur | _ | | 1 | ^ | - | 0 | _ | 4 | _ | 4 00 | 1121/1400 | 4 00 | 1 16 | 4 40 | 4 42 | 4 00 |
| | | uctor's lecture | | | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | | 1131/1409 | | 4.46 | | 4.43 | 4.08 |
| | | ctor seem inter | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | | | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.67 | 4.85 |
| | | | | explained clearly | 1 | | 1 | | 3 | 5 | 4 | | 1125/1399 | | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.27 | 3.85 |
| | | es contribute t | | - | 1 | | 0 | 1 | 3 | 5 | | | 1074/1400 | | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 3.92 |
| 5. Did au | udiovisua. | l techniques en | hance y | our understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 4.00 | 590/1179 | 4.00 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.02 | 4.00 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did cl | lass disc | ussions contrib | ute to | what you learned | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 3.70 | 913/1262 | 3.70 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.14 | 3.70 |
| 2. Were a | all stude | nts actively en | courage | ed to participate | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4.10 | 867/1259 | 4.10 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.10 |
| 3. Did th | ne instru | ctor encourage | fair an | d open discussion | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 4.10 | 860/1256 | 4.10 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.10 |
| 4. Were s | special te | echniques succe | ssful | - | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4.33 | 254/ 788 | 4.33 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.33 |
| | | | | Frequ | iencs | , Dis | trib | utio | n | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | _ | .01107 | 210 | 0112 | 4010. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits E | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | | | | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | 5 |
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 9 | | Required fo | | | | aior | s | 1 | Graduat | е | 0 | Majo | or | 0 |
| 28-55 | 1 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 1 | | | | | | J | | | | | | 5 | | |
| 56-83 | 2 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 1 | General | | | | | | 1 | Under-g | rad 1 | .4 | Non- | -major | 2 | |
| 84-150 | 3 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | Comercia | | | | | | | | | | 3 - | | | |
| Grad. | 0 | 3.50-4.00 | 4 | F 0 | Electives | | | | | | 0 | #### - | Means t | here a | re not | enou | ah | |
| | | | | Р 0 | | FIECCIVES | | | | | | | respons | | | | _ | • |
| | | | | I O | | Ot1 | her | | | | 1 | .0 | - | | | | | |

Course-Section: SPAN 312 0101 University of Maryland Title INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1409

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | Frequencies | | | | | | | Inst | ructor | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|-------------|----|-----|---|---|---|----|------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3.77 | 1248/1481 | 3.77 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.29 | 3.77 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4.08 | 971/1481 | 4.08 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.23 | 4.08 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 4.25 | 742/1249 | 4.25 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.28 | 4.25 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 4 | 4.00 | 959/1424 | | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.27 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 4.31 | 459/1396 | | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.00 | 4.31 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 4 | 4.08 | 713/1342 | | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.12 | 4.08 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3.85 | 1094/1459 | 3.85 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.17 | 3.85 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 4.85 | 784/1480 | 4.85 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.65 | 4.85 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 4.08 | 792/1450 | 4.08 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.10 | 4.08 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | ٥ | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | _ | 3 | 2 60 | 1265/1409 | 3.69 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.43 | 3.69 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 4.77 | 804/1407 | | 4.40 | 4.42 | 4.43 | 4.77 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 7 | Τ0 | | 1185/1399 | | 4.77 | 4.09 | 4.07 | 3.69 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 6 | | 1017/1400 | | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.27 | 4.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 3.27 | 992/1179 | | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.02 | 3.27 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | U | ۷ | 2 | Т | ۷ | 4 | ۷ | 3.27 | 992/11/9 | 3.47 | 3.94 | 3.90 | 4.02 | 3.47 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 4.00 | 708/1262 | 4.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.14 | 4.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 4.75 | 358/1259 | 4.75 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.34 | 4.75 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 4.63 | 496/1256 | 4.63 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.34 | 4.63 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2 | 4.25 | 291/ 788 | 4.25 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 4.25 |
| P | | | 2 1 | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

Course-Section: SPAN 401 0101 University of Maryland Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN Baltimore County

Baltimore County Spring 2006 Page 1410

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: BELL, ALAN S

Enrollment: 11
Ouestionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean Mean General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 0 5 4.71 340/1481 4.71 4.26 4.29 4.45 4.71 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 264/1481 4.71 4.26 4.23 4.32 4.71 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 5 4.71 278/1249 4.71 4.37 4.27 4.44 4.71 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 0 0 0 2 4 4.67 287/1424 4.67 4.27 4.21 4.35 4.67 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 1 0 1 0 2 3 4.17 584/1396 4.17 4.07 3.98 4.09 4.17 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 2 4 4.43 384/1342 4.43 4.12 4.07 4.21 4.437. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 1 0 2 4 4.29 749/1459 4.29 4.19 4.16 4.25 4.29 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 5 2 4.29 1193/1480 4.29 4.64 4.68 4.74 4.29 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 0 3 2 4.40 473/1450 4.40 4.10 4.09 4.28 4.40 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 Ω 0 2 5 4.71 483/1409 4.71 4.46 4.42 4.51 4.71 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 7 5.00 1/1407 5.00 4.77 4.69 4.79 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 2 2 3 4.14 929/1399 4.14 4.30 4.26 4.36 4.14 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 3 3 4.29 844/1400 4.29 4.35 4.27 4.38 4.29 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 152/1179 4.71 3.94 3.96 4.07 4.71 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 1 6 4.71 236/1262 4.71 4.18 4.05 4.33 4.71 0 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 1 0 6 4.71 402/1259 4.71 4.40 4.29 4.57 4.71 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 532/1256 4.57 4.34 4.30 4.60 4.57 4. Were special techniques successful 0 0 0 0 3 4 4.57 159/ 788 4.57 4.03 4.00 4.26 4.57

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421 0101 University of Maryland Title STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1411

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 14 Questionnaires: 8 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

SINNIGEN, JOHN

Instructor:

| | | | | | | | Frequencies | | | | | Instructor | | Course Dept | | pt UMBC Level | | Sect |
|---|-----------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|-------|------|------------|-------------------------------|-------------|--------|---------------|--------|------|
| Questions | | | | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | |
| | | Genera | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | | | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1481 | 5.00 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.45 | 5.00 |
| _ | _ | ctor make clear | | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 149/1481 | 4.86 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.32 | 4.86 |
| | | uestions reflec | | - | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1249 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did o | ther eval | uations reflect | the ex | spected goals | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1424 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.35 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did a | ssigned r | eadings contrib | ute to | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1396 | 5.00 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.09 | 5.00 |
| 6. Did w | ritten as | signments contr | ibute t | to what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1342 | 5.00 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.21 | 5.00 |
| 7. Was t | he gradin | g system clearl | y expla | ained | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4.83 | 143/1459 | 4.83 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.25 | 4.83 |
| 8. How ma | any times | was class cand | elled | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1480 | 5.00 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.74 | 5.00 |
| 9. How w | ould you | grade the overa | ll tead | ching effectiveness | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4.71 | 184/1450 | 4.71 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 4.28 | 4.71 |
| | | Lectur | e | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were | the instr | uctor's lecture | s well | prepared | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 261/1409 | 4.86 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.51 | 4.86 |
| 2. Did t | he instru | ctor seem inter | ested i | n the subject | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.79 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | | | | | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 170/1399 | 4.86 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.36 | 4.86 |
| 4. Did t | he lectur | es contribute t | o what | you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 198/1400 | 4.86 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.38 | 4.86 |
| 5. Did a | udiovisua | l techniques en | hance y | our understanding | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 4.57 | 223/1179 | 4.57 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 4.07 | 4.57 |
| | | Discus | sion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did c | lass disc | ussions contrib | ute to | what you learned | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1262 | 5.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.33 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were | all stude | nts actively en | courage | ed to participate | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 5.00 | 1/1259 | 5.00 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.57 | 5.00 |
| 3. Did t | he instru | ctor encourage | fair ar | nd open discussion | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4.43 | 658/1256 | 4.43 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.60 | 4.43 |
| 4. Were | special t | echniques succe | ssful | | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4.86 | 83/ 788 | 4.86 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.86 |
| | | | | Frequ | iency | Dist | trib | utio: | n | | | | | | | | | |
| Credits 1 | Earned | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | | | Re | asons | 3 | | | Ту | pe | | | Majors | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | - | | | | |
| 00-27 | 0 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | A 0 | | Red | quir | ed f | or Ma | ajors | 3 | 0 | Graduat | е | 1 | Majo | r | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В 6 | | | | _ | | | | _ | _ | | _ | | | _ |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C 0 | | Gei | nera | T | | | | 0 | Under-g | rad | 7 | Non- | major | 1 |
| 84-150 | 2 | 3.00-3.49 | 1 | D 0 | | | | | | | | _ | | . = | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 1 | F 0 | | Ele | ecti | ves | | | | 1 | #### - Means there are not en | | | | _ | jh |
| | | | | P 0 | | | | | | | | _ | respons | es to b | e sign | ufican | ıt | |
| | | | | I 0 | | Other | | | | | | 5 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101 University of Maryland Title TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI

Baltimore County Spring 2006

Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST

Enrollment: 18 Ouestionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions 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 12 4.92 127/1481 4.92 4.26 4.29 4.45 4.92

Page 1412

JUN 13, 2006

Job IRBR3029

2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 0 0 3 10 4.77 219/1481 4.77 4.26 4.23 4.32 4.77 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 5 0 0 0 1 7 4.88 160/1249 4.88 4.37 4.27 4.44 4.88 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 1 11 4.69 263/1424 4.69 4.27 4.21 4.35 4.69 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 102/1396 4.83 4.07 3.98 4.09 4.83 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned $1 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 11 \quad 4.92$ 77/1342 4.92 4.12 4.07 4.21 4.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 0 0 1 1 10 4.75 196/1459 4.75 4.19 4.16 4.25 4.75

8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 10 4.83 797/1480 4.83 4.64 4.68 4.74 4.83 99/1450 4.90 4.10 4.09 4.28 4.90

Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 0 0 0 0 0 0 13 5.00 1/1409 5.00 4.46 4.42 4.51 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 13 5.00 1/1407 5.00 4.77 4.69 4.79 5.00 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 103/1399 4.92 4.30 4.26 4.36 4.92 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 2 11 4.85 208/1400 4.85 4.35 4.27 4.38 4.85

5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1 12 4.92 70/1179 4.92 3.94 3.96 4.07 4.92 Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 10 4.91 126/1262 4.91 4.18 4.05 4.33 4.91 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1259 5.00 4.40 4.29 4.57 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 0 11 5.00 1/1256 5.00 4.34 4.30 4.60 5.00

4. Were special techniques successful 2 2 0 0 1 1 7 4.67 133/ 788 4.67 4.03 4.00 4.26 4.67

| Credits Earned | | Cum. GPA | | Expected Grades | | Reasons | | Type | Majors | | |
|----------------|---|-----------|---|-----------------|---|---------------------|---|--------------|--------|----------------|---|
| 00-27 | 1 | 0.00-0.99 | 0 | А | 8 | Required for Majors | 0 | Graduate | 1 | Major | 0 |
| 28-55 | 0 | 1.00-1.99 | 0 | В | 5 | | | | | | |
| 56-83 | 0 | 2.00-2.99 | 0 | C | 0 | General | 4 | Under-grad | 12 | Non-major | 2 |
| 84-150 | 5 | 3.00-3.49 | 3 | D | 0 | | | | | | |
| Grad. | 1 | 3.50-4.00 | 7 | F | 0 | Electives | 0 | #### - Means | there | are not enough | |
| | | | | P | 0 | | | responses to | be sig | nificant | |
| | | | | I | 0 | Other | 9 | - | | | |
| | | | | ? | 0 | | | | | | |

Course-Section: SPAN 601 0101

Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN

Instructor: BELL, ALAN S

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2006

Page 1413 JUN 13, 2006 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

| | | | Fre | Frequencies | | | | Instructor | | Course | Dept | UMBC | Level | Sect |
|---|------|------|-----|-------------|---|---|---|------------|-----------|--------|------|------|-------|------|
| Questions | NR | NA | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Mean | Rank | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean | Mean |
| General | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1069/1481 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.29 | 4.28 | 4.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1000/1481 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.23 | 4.11 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1249 | 5.00 | 4.37 | 4.27 | 4.24 | 5.00 |
| 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1424 | 5.00 | 4.27 | 4.21 | 4.16 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 707/1396 | 4.00 | 4.07 | 3.98 | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 755/1342 | 4.00 | 4.12 | 4.07 | 4.18 | 4.00 |
| 7. Was the grading system clearly explained | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1459 | 5.00 | 4.19 | 4.16 | 4.01 | 5.00 |
| 8. How many times was class cancelled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1349/1480 | 4.00 | 4.64 | 4.68 | 4.74 | 4.00 |
| 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 836/1450 | 4.00 | 4.10 | 4.09 | 3.96 | 4.00 |
| Lecture | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1409 | 5.00 | 4.46 | 4.42 | 4.36 | 5.00 |
| 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1407 | 5.00 | 4.77 | 4.69 | 4.73 | 5.00 |
| 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 1002/1399 | 4.00 | 4.30 | 4.26 | 4.16 | 4.00 |
| 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1400 | 5.00 | 4.35 | 4.27 | 4.17 | 5.00 |
| 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1179 | 5.00 | 3.94 | 3.96 | 3.81 | 5.00 |
| Discussion | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | Λ | 1 | 5.00 | 1/1262 | 5.00 | 4.18 | 4.05 | 4.07 | 5.00 |
| 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 895/1259 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 4.29 | 4.30 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 901/1256 | 4.00 | 4.34 | 4.30 | 4.33 | 4.00 |
| 4. Were special techniques successful | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 394/ 788 | 4.00 | 4.03 | 4.00 | 3.97 | 4.00 |
| i. Were special ecominques successial | O | O | Ü | Ü | J | _ | Ü | 1.00 | 3317 700 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.00 | 3.37 | 1.00 |
| Seminar | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 68 | 5.00 | 4.66 | 4.49 | 4.23 | 5.00 |
| 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 4.00 | 58/ 69 | 4.00 | 4.26 | 4.53 | 4.46 | 4.00 |
| 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 63 | 5.00 | 4.24 | 4.44 | 4.44 | 5.00 |
| 5. Were criteria for grading made clear | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5.00 | 1/ 68 | 5.00 | 3.98 | 3.92 | 3.71 | 5.00 |
| Frequ | encv | Dist | rib | ution | ı | | | | | | | | | |

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