Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: VESPOINT, ANDRE

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 24

Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1546 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			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. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	1	2	9	11	4.30	912/1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	9	15	4.63	414/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.63
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	3	8	13	4.42	653/1375	4.19	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.42
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	16	4.63	362/1595	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	5	10	6	3.83	996/1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	4	15	4.45	451/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.45
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	4.33	720/1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	782/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	0	0	0	0	8	9	4.53	356/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.53
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	4	19	4.75	480/1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	4	20	4.83	765/1572	4.74	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1			4.70	434/1564	3.96	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.70
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	18	4.71	463/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	1	3	9		4.00	690/1352		3.97			4.00
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	247/1384	4.11	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	1	1	2	12	4.56	570/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.56
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	1	15	4.94	185/1368	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.94
4. Were special techniques successful	8	0	0	1	0	4	11	4.56	183/ 948	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.56
- 1														
Laboratory	00	0	0	0	1	0	1	4 00	**** / O10	****	1 60	4 10	4 00	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 243		4.69	4.12	4.08	
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	2	3	1	2	0	1	2.29	517/ 555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	2.29
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	3	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 48	***	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	***	4.67	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	***	4.67	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	18	1	1	2	0	1	1	2.80	****/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.51	****
Calf Darad														
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****
	22	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16		****
 Did study questions make clear the expected goal Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 	22	0	0	0	U T	1	1		****/ 41		****	4.16	4.06 4.27	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	U	U	U	U	Τ	Τ	4.50	41			4.43	4.4/	

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: VESPOINT, ANDRE

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1546 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	5	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	10						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-		_	
				?	1						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: VESPOINT, ANDRE

Enrollment: 32 Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1547 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	S		Inst	ructor	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	0	0	2	8	18	4.57	550/1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	22	4.71	300/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	21	4.75	296/1375	4.19	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	7	19	4.61	383/1595		4.29	4.20	4.03	4.61
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	6	7	12	4.07	768/1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.07
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	0	2	7	17	4.58	331/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.58
 Was the grading system clearly explained 	1	0	0	0	6	6	15	4.33	720/1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	12	15		1148/1646		4.59	4.69	4.67	4.56
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	8	15	4.58	305/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.58
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	3	23	4.81	372/1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.81
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	26	4.96	237/1572	4.74	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.96
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	7	19	4.73	374/1564	3.96	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	24	4.89	227/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.89
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	2	7	5	9	3.91	805/1352	3.59	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.91
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	3	4	10	4.28	661/1384	4.11	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.28
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.20	521/1382	4.51	4.20	4.29	4.03	4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	0	3	2	12	4.63	639/1368					
4. Were special techniques successful	11 11	0	1	0	2	8	6	4.53	420/ 948	4.48 4.05	4.42 4.10	4.30	4.01 3.75	4.53 4.06
4. Were special techniques successful	ТТ	U	Т	U	4	8	О	4.06	420/ 948	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.06
Laboratory														
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	27	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	27	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	1	2	1	2	0	1		****/ 555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
		_			_	-	_		, 555					
Seminar														
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	22	1	1	2	1	0	1	2.60	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	27	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	1	0	3	1	3	0	3.00	256/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68		3.00
		_	-	_	_	_	-							
Self Paced	0.77	0	0	0	_	0	-	F 00	**** / F2		F 00	4 20	4 15	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	27	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	26	0	1	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: VESPOINT, ANDRE

Enrollment: 32
Questionnaires: 28

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1547 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits I	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99	0	 А	9	Required for Majors	15	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	5	Under-grad	28	Non-major	27
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	5	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5	-			
				?	4						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: COYNE, MARIA

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1548 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Ouestions			NIR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructo: Rar		Course	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General																	
1. Did yo	ou gain nev	w insights,skil	ls from this cou	ırse	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	776/1	1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.40
2. Did th	e instruct	tor make clear	the expected goa	als	0	0	0	1	2	5	12	4.40	702/1	1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.40
3. Did th	e exam que	estions reflect	the expected go	oals	0	0	0	0	0	11	9	4.45	617/1	1375	4.19	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.45
4. Did ot	her evalua	ations reflect	the expected goa	als	0	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	890/1	1595	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.20
5. Did as	signed rea	adings contribu	te to what you i	learned	0	0	3	3	3	5	6	3.40	1317/1	1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.40
6. Did wr	itten ass:	ignments contri	bute to what you	ı learned	0	0	0	0	6	7	7	4.05	859/1	1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.05
7. Was th	e grading	system clearly	explained		0	0	0	1	2	7	10	4.30	757/1	1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.30
8. How ma	ny times v	was class cance	lled		0	0	0	0	0	4	16	4.80	833/1	1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.80
9. How wo	ould you gr	rade the overal	l teaching effe	ctiveness	4	1	0	0	2	10	3	4.07	881/1	1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.07
		Lecture																	
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	1	4	5	10	4.20	1169/1	1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.20
2. Did th	ne instruct	tor seem intere	sted in the sub;	ject	0	0	0	0	0	2	18	4.90	591/1	1572	4.74	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.90
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presented	and explained	clearly	0	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	939/1	1564	3.96	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.25
			what you learne		0	0	0	1	0	4	15	4.65	524/1		4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.65
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	ance your unders	standing	0	1	0	1	5	5	8	4.05	661/1	1352	3.59	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.05
		Discuss	ion																
1. Did cl	ass discus	ssions contribu	te to what you i	Learned	7	0	0	0	3	3	7	4.31	644/1	1384	4.11	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.31
2. Were a	ll student	ts actively enc	ouraged to part:	icipate	7	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	530/1	1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.62
3. Did th	e instruct	tor encourage f	air and open dia	scussion	7	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	415/1	1368	4.48	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.77
4. Were s	special ted	chniques succes	sful		7	2	0	0	3	2	6	4.27	334/	948	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.27
		Laborat	ory																
5. Were r	equirement	ts for lab repo	rts clearly spec	cified	12	0	5	2	0	0	1	1.75	534/	555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	1.75
		Seminar																	
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	clear		16	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	***
		Field W	ork																
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out field activ	rities	15	1	4	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.51	***
				Frequ	uency	Dist	trib	utio	n										
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expect	ed Grades				Re:	ason	g				Tyr	ne.			Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0 A	8		Red	quire	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	0	Grad	duate	9	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0 B	7															
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2 C	0		Gei	nera:	1				1	Unde	er-gi	rad 2	:0	Non-	major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	6 D	0												_			_
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0 F	0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0			Means t			_	h
			P	0									res	onse	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
			I	0		Otl	ner					4							
			?	0															

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: CURTO, NATALIA

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 26

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1549 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies	s		Inst	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	2	8	8	8	3.85	1319/1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.85
2. Did the	e instruc	ctor make clear	the expe	ected goals	0	0	1	5	8	4	8	3.50	1481/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	3.50
3. Did the	e exam qu	estions reflect	t the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	5	12	9	4.15	882/1375	4.19	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.15
4. Did oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the expe	ected goals	0	1	1	1	4	10	9	4.00	1067/1595	4.16	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.00
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to wh	nat you learned	1	2	4	2	5	7	5	3.30	1347/1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.30
				what you learned	1	1	0	1	6	9			883/1512		4.19	4.10	3.86	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	g system clearly	y explaim	ned	0	0	5	3	6	5	7	3.23	1489/1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.23
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	3	21	2	3.96	1568/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	3.96
9. How wou	ıld you g	grade the overa	ll teach:	ing effectiveness	6	1	2	1	8	7	1	3.21	1460/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.21
		Lecture	e															
1. Were th	ne instru	ctor's lecture		repared	2	0	0	5	7	4	8	3.63	1435/1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.63
		tor seem inter			2	0	0	1	3	6			1339/1572		4.79		4.64	
				plained clearly	2	0	1	3	8	5			1365/1564			4.28		3.58
		es contribute to			2	0	0	4	5	5			1211/1559		4.43		4.20	
				ur understanding	2	9	1	0	4	2			655/1352		3.97		3.86	
		Discus	aion															
ו הלא אור				nat you learned	14	0	0	1	2	4	_	4.08	767/1384	1 1 1 1 1	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.08
				to participate	14	0	0	0	1	4			616/1382					4.50
		_	_	open discussion	14	0	0	0	0	4			522/1368			4.29		4.67
		chniques succe		open discussion	14	2	0	0	3	4	3						3.75	
. were sp	peciai te	ecinitques succes	SSIUI		14	2	U	U	3	4	3	4.00	431/ 940	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.00
		Labora	tory															
5. Were re	equiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	23	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
		Field V	Work															
5. Did con	nferences	s help you carry	y out fie	eld activities	23	2	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	n									
O		Com CDA		Demonstrad Consider				Das		_			m.				Mada	_
Credits Ea 	arnea 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades					asons	S 			 1.Σ	pe 			Majors 	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	1	A 10		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	2	Graduat	e	0	Majo	r	0
28-55	5	1.00-1.99	0	В 11			_					_						
56-83	9	2.00-2.99	3	C 2		Ger	nera!	L				6	Under-9	grad 2	26	Non-	-major	26
		3.00-3.49	5	D 1														
84-150	2		_															•h
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				1		Means t				111
	_		6	P 1				ves				_	#### - respons					111
	_		6	- 0			ectiv ner	ves				1						311

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: AREVALOGUERRERO

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1550 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncie:	s 4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General	0	0	2	_	4	7	0	2 00	1602/1640	4 00	4 24	4 00	4 11	2 00
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	3 4	5 3	4 6	7 6	2		1603/1649	4.02	4.34	4.28	4.11 4.16	3.00 2.95
 Did the instructor make clear the expected goals Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	2	5 5	3	9	2		1598/1648 1298/1375	4.04 4.19	4.31 4.42	4.23 4.27	4.10	3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	3	5	10	1		1463/1595	4.16	4.42	4.20	4.10	3.35
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	5	8	3		1354/1533	3.58	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	2	4	6	4	4		1395/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.20
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	3	2	7	4	5		1478/1623	3.90	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.29
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	10			1175/1646	4.53	4.59	4.69	4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	1	2	2	7	5	0	2.94	1525/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	3.96	2.94
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	3	0	5	9	3		1470/1568	4.17	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.45
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	7	12		1108/1572	4.74	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	6	4	3	7	0		1544/1564	3.96	4.28	4.28	4.20	2.55
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	4	1	7	5	3		1468/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.10
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	6	7	1	4	1	0	1.92	1342/1352	3.59	3.97	3.98	3.86	1.92
Discussion	-	0		_	2	_	2	2 1 5	1000/1204	4 11	4 00	4 00	2 06	2 15
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	7 1	3	6	3		1228/1384	4.11	4.28	4.08	3.86	3.15
 Were all students actively encouraged to participate Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 	1	0	1		1	6 6	11 6	4.25	831/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	1 1	2	2	2 1	<i>3</i>	7	-		1181/1368 776/ 948	4.48 4.05	4.42	4.30	4.01 3.75	3.50
4. Were special techniques successiui	Τ.	2	۷		O	,	۷	3.33	770/ 940	4.05	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.33
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	17	2	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	0	0	0	1	1	1			****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	0	0	0	2	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	3	4.25	****/ 555	2.02	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar	1.0	0	1	0	^	_	1	2 00	**** 00	****	4 20	4 54	4 21	****
 Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme Was the instructor available for individual attention 	19 19	0	1 0	0 1	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 88 ****/ 85	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	1	0 1	3.00	,	****	4.20	4.47 4.43	4.30 4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	1	0	0	1		****/ 92	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	18	0	0	2	0	0	1		****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****
	10	Ü	Ü	2	Ü	J	•	3.00	, 200		2.75	3.00	3.31	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1			****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	19	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	19 16	0 1	0	3	1	0 1	1		****/ 39 ****/ 312	****	4.67 2.48	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	U	3	U	Τ	U	2.50	^^^^/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.08	3.51	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	19	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	19	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.30	,	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	19	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: AREVALOGUERRERO

Enrollment: 30
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1550 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	7	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	2						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	_			
				?	2						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: BURGOS, FELIX A

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1551 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								T		a	D t-	TTMDG	T 1	0
Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_		Level Mean	Sect Mear
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	644/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	7	4.36	770/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.36
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	347/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	6		4.54	462/1595	4.06		4.20	4.03	4.54
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	3	5		4.21	663/1533	3.80		4.04	3.87	4.21
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	6	-	4.43	493/1512	4.00	4.19		3.86	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	4		4.43		4.04		4.16	4.08	4.4
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.71	977/1646			4.69	4.67	4.7
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	1	3		4.71	374/1621				3.96	4.50
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	U	U	U	1	3	0	4.50	3/4/1021	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.90	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	4.57	767/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.5
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3		4.79	876/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.7
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5		4.50	651/1564			4.28	4.20	4.5
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5		4.64		4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.6
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	240/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.6
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	376/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.6
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	3	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	511/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.6
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	4	-	4.60	579/1368		4.42		4.01	
4. Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	0	5		4.38	293/ 948		4.10		3.75	4.3
T - 12														
Laboratory	_			•	_	_					4 00		4 05	***
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	9	3	0	0	1	1	0		****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	188/ 243	3.75	4.69	4.12	4.08	3.7
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	3	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	11	2	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	0	1	0	0	2	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	11	1	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 312	2.80		3.68	3.51	***
J. Did conferences help you carry out freid activities	11	1	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	/ 512	2.00	2.40	3.00	3.31	
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	***
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	0	0	0	0	3	0.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	***
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	11	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 41	***	****	4.43	4.27	***
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	2	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	***
Frequ	ency.	Dist	tribu	ıtior	n									
														5

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	14	Non-major	14
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h

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

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1552 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 17

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

							Fr	equei	ncies			Ins	tructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	\$		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		m this course	1	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	1096/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.13
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	4	6	6	4.13	1043/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.13
		estions reflect			1	0	0	2	3	4	7	4.00	950/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.00
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	0	0	0	5	2	9	4.25	818/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.25
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contribu	ite to	what you learned	1	0	1	1	6	3	5	3.63	1166/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.63
6. Did wr	itten ass	signments contri	bute t	o what you learned	1	0	0	2	4	1	9	4.06	854/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.06
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearly	expla	ined	1	0	1	0	5	4	6	3.88	1198/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.88
8. How ma	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overal	l teac	hing effectiveness	7	0	0	0	2	6	2	4.00	914/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.00
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures	well	prepared	2	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	731/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.60
		ctor seem intere			2	0	0	0	1	1			840/1572			4.70	4.64	4.80
				xplained clearly	2	0	0	0	4	4			1001/1564		4.28	4.28		4.20
		es contribute to			2	0	0	0	1	5			662/1559					4.53
				our understanding	2	0	1	0	2	4		4.20					3.86	
		_																
1 Did cl	agg digg	Discuss		what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	4	5	4.27	661/1384	4 16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.27
				d to participate	6	0	0	0	1	0			332/1382				4.03	4.82
				d open discussion	6	0	0	0	2	2			703/1368			4.30		4.45
		echniques succes		a open arbeablin	6	1	0	0	1	2			170/ 948				3.75	
		Laborat	orv															
5. Were r	equiremer		-	early specified	15	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria f	for grading made			15	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	****
		Field W	lork															
1. Did fi	eld exper	rience contribut	e to w	hat you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	***
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	11	1	0	3	0	2	0	2.80	267/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	2.80
		Self F	aced															
1. Did se	lf-paced	system contribu	ite to	what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Tv	ре			Majors	5
00-27	1 2	0.00-0.99	0	A 2 B 8		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-55 56-83	4	1.00-1.99	2	В 8 С 2		Cos	nera	1				0	Indox ~	mad .	17	Mon	maiom	17
56-83 84-150	4 1	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	2	D 1		Gei	iera.	т				U	Under-g	ıau .	L /	MOIJ-	-major	Τ/
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0		רם.	ecti [.]					0	#### -	Meane +	there -	are not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	O	P 0		ET.	=C L I	veb				U	respons				_	111
				I O		∩+1	ner					4	T Capolla	1	oc bigi	cai		
				2 0		001						-						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: KING, ROBIN R

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1553

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	4	12	4.35	844/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.35
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	2	3	6	9	4.10	1065/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.10
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	2	3	7	7	3.85	1060/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.85
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	2	7	9	4.10	1010/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	7	5	7	3.85	966/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.85
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	2	7	2	6	3.30	1356/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	2	4	1	12	4.21	861/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.21
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.95	398/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	10	1	0	0	6	0	3	3.67	1261/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.67
T														
Lecture	1	0	1	0	2	_	1.0	4 01	1152/1560	4 01	4 20	4 42	4 20	4 01
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1 1	0	1 0	0	3 1	5 2	10		1153/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.21 4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	1	1	2	7	16 8	4.79	876/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64 4.20	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	5	8		1105/1564 1166/1559	4.03 4.24	4.28 4.43	4.28 4.29	4.20	3.95
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	4	4	5 4	-		1122/1352	3.84		3.98	3.86	3.35
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	۷	Т	4	4	4	4	3.33	1122/1352	3.04	3.97	3.90	3.00	3.35
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	7	1	6	3.93	867/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	3.93
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	616/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	3	2	7	4.15	896/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.15
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	2	3	3	6	3.93	512/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.93
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 243	3.75	4.69	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	1	0	2	1	0	1	3.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5 00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	1	3	1	0	1	2		248/ 288		2.95	3.68	3.54	
		_	_	_	-	_	_							
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	18	1	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	1	1	2	0	0	1	2.50	****/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	****
· ·														
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	18	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	18	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	18	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: KING, ROBIN R

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1553 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	1	A	11	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	2						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	3	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	20	Non-major	20
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_			
				?	0						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor:

Enrollment: 28

Baltimore County Fall 2008 QUIROGA, MARIA

FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Page 1554

Questionnaires: 23

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

				equei			_		tructor	Course	_	UMBC		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	14	5	3.96	1227/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.96
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	4	10	8	4.09	1076/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.09
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	9	6	3.65	1153/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	3.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	1	1	5	6	7	3.85	1231/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.85
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	3	9	8	4.14	718/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	6	5	10	3.96	952/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.96
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	6	7	6	3.68	1308/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.68
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	5.00	1/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	1	0	0	3	8	5	4.13	835/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.13
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	2	2	6	10	4.20	1169/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	1	19	4.81	840/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.81
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	4	1	5	10	4.05	1105/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.05
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	2	7	10	4.25	966/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.25
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	1	0	6	5	6	3.83	860/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.83
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	1	4	5	4.09	764/1384		4.28	4.08	3.86	4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	1	8	4.36	749/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.36
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	1	3	6	4.18	881/1368		4.42	4.30	4.01	4.18
4. Were special techniques successful	12	3	1	0	2	1	4	3.88	546/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.88
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 243	3.75	4.69	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	19	0	1	1	0	1	1	3.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	22	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	22	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	22	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	4.27	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	22	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 23

II Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1554 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 7	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-		-	
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 102 0601
Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

University of Maryland
II Baltimore County
Fall 2008

Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA

Enrollment: 25
Questionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1555 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equer	ncie	s		Inst	ructor	Course	_	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	2	9	8	4.32	898/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.32
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	756/1648	4.04	4.31	4.23	4.16	4.37
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	6	10	4.33	733/1375	4.04	4.42	4.27	4.10	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	6	4	8	4.11	996/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.11
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	2	3	8	6	3.95	875/1533	3.80	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.95
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	3	6	8	4.17	782/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	4	5	9	4.16	926/1623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.16
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	4.95	398/1646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	1	10	3	4.14	812/1621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	4.14
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	791/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	17	4.94	355/1572	4.66	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	1	3	4	9	4.06	1105/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	4.06
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	0	5	12	4.50	695/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	3	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	495/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	4.29
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	644/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.30
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	616/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	2	4	4	4.20	876/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.20
4. Were special techniques successful	9	1	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	353/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.22
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	ution	n									

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	C	8	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	_	_		
				2	0						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: NASH, LYLE

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 19 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1556 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

								equer		5			tructor		_		Level		
		Questions	5			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera																	
1 Did vo	nı gain ne	w insights,skil		m this course		0	0	0	2	1	8	8	4 16	1067/1649	4.10	4 34	4.28	4.11	4.16
		tor make clear				0	0	3	1	3	4	8		1395/1648		4.31	4.23		3.68
		estions reflect				0	0	1	0	5	6	7		1000/1375		4.42	4.27		3.95
	_	ations reflect		_		0	0	1	1	4	9	4		1295/1595		4.29	4.20	4.03	
		adings contrib			ed	0	1	1	4	2	7			1249/1533		4.16	4.04		3.50
	-	ignments contr		-		0	0	0	1	4	8			883/1512		4.19	4.10	3.86	4.00
		system clearly				0	0	0	3	3	6			1186/1623		4.08	4.16	4.08	3.89
		was class cance				0	1	0	0	1	14			1498/1646		4.59	4.69	4.67	
		rade the overa		hing effective	ness	5	0	0	1	1	10			1030/1621				3.96	
		T = =======																	
1 Wara +	ho inatru	Lecture ctor's lectures		nronarod		2	0	0	1	5	7	1	2 02	1377/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.82
		n the subject		2	0	0	0	2	5	10		1265/1572		4.79	4.70		4.47		
		xplained clear	117	2	0	0	1	4	6			1127/1564		4.28	4.28	4.20	4.00		
		Τ γ	2	0	1	1	0	4			881/1559		4.43	4.29		4.35			
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						2	1	0	6	6			1034/1352			3.98		
J. Did at	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understan							_	U	U	O	2	3.33	1034/1332	3.01	3.91	3.90	3.00	3.33
		Discus	sion																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ssions contribu	ite to	what you learn	ied	11	0	0	0	3	2	3	4.00	795/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.00
2. Were a	all studen	ts actively end	courage	d to participa	te	11	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63		4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.63
		tor encourage i		d open discuss	ion	11	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	560/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.63
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	ssful			11	0	0	1	1	3	3	4.00	431/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.00
		Laborat	orv																
5. Were r	requiremen	ts for lab repo	-	early specifie	ed.	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
		a .																	
5 Were c	riteria f	Seminal or grading made				17	0	1	0	0	1	0	2 50	****/ 288	1 86	2 95	3 68	3 54	****
J. WEIC C	JIICCIIA I	or grading made	CICAL			Ι,	O	_	O	O	_	Ü	2.50	/ 200	1.00	2.75	3.00	3.31	
					Freque	ncy	Dist	cribu	ution	1									
Credits E	ades				Rea	ason	S			Ту	pe			Majors	}				
00 27	0	0.00-0.99	0									 a 1		Cmaduat			 Mo ∹ -		
00-27 28-55	-		-	A 1 B 7			Kec	quire	eu I	λτ. IAI9	ajor	s I	U	Graduat	e	0	Majo)T	0
28-55 56-83	0 3	1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99	0 3	В 7 С 3			C c ··	20205	1				1	IIndox ~	mad 1	9	N	mo i o	19
							Ger	neral	L				Τ	Under-g	rau l	7	NON-	-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D 1															

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	1	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3	D	1						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	a
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	1						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: NASH, LYLE

Enrollment:

21 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Fall 2008

Baltimore County

Page 1557 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	auer	ncies	3		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean			Mean	Mean		Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	2	4	1	3	2 00	1595/1649	4.10	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.08
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	2	1	4	2	3		1563/1648		4.34	4.23	4.11	3.06
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	2	0	4	2	4		1208/1375		4.42	4.27	4.10	3.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	2	0	3	2	_		1387/1595	4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	3.55
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	0	3	3	3		1366/1533		4.16	4.04	3.87	3.25
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	3	4		1082/1512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	0	1	3	6		1164/1623	4.04		4.16	4.08	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	11			1513/1646		4.59	4.69	4.67	4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	3	0	2	5	2	3.25	1451/1621			4.06	3.96	3.25
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	2	1	3	4	2	3.25	1496/1568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.25
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	2	0	3	0	7		1506/1572		4.79	4.70	4.64	3.83
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	2	0	5	1	4	3.42	1423/1564	4.03	4.28	4.28	4.20	3.42
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	2	2	2	4	3.33	1424/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	3.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	3.22	1170/1352	3.84	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.22
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	2	0	1	2	3	3.50	1081/1384	4.16	4.28	4.08	3.86	3.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	1	1	0	0	6	4.13	911/1382	4.51	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.13
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	1	3	0	4	3.88	1043/1368	4.31	4.42	4.30	4.01	3.88
4. Were special techniques successful	4	3	2	0	2	0	1	2.60	905/ 948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	2.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1 00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.05	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 243	3.75	4.69	4.12	4.08	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	11	0	1	0	0	0	0		****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.38	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	2	1	0	0	0	1.33	550/ 555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	1.33
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	4.31	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	,	****	4.20	4.47	4.30	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 81	****	4.23	4.43	4.39	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.01	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	3	0	0	0	0	1.00	283/ 288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	1.00
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.72	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00		****	5.00	4.09	3.65	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00		****	4.67	4.47	4.36	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.37	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	2.80	2.48	3.68	3.51	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.17	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.06	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	11	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	4.24	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.83	****

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: NASH, LYLE

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1557 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	2	General	0	Under-grad 1	12	Non-major	12
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means t	there an	re not enough	h
				P	0			responses to b	oe signi	ificant	
				I	0	Other	5	_	_		
				?	0						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1558 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Constiant						Fre	equer	ncies	\$		Inst	ructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions			NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	k	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General																	
1 Did v	vou gain ne	General w insights,skil		COURSE	1	0	0	Λ	4	6	10	4.30	912/1	649	4 10	4.34	4 28	4.11	4.30
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	4	5	12	4.38	729/1		4.04		4.23	4.16	4.38
		estions reflect			0	0	1	1	1	6		4.29	780/1				4.27	4.10	
	_	ations reflect	_	-	0	0	0	2	1	6	12	4.33	722/1		4.06	4.29	4.20	4.03	4.33
		adings contribu			1	5	0	1	5	4	5		955/1		3.80	4.16		3.87	
		signments contri			0	0	0	2	1	8	10	4.24	711/1	512	4.00	4.19	4.10	3.86	4.24
		system clearly		-	0	0	0	1	4	6	10	4.19	883/1	623	4.04	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.19
		was class cance			0	0	0	1	0	0	20	4.86	748/1	646	4.71	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.86
9. How w	would you g	grade the overal	l teaching e	ffectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	13	2	3.89	1078/1	621	3.94	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.89
		Lecture																	
1. Were	the instru	actor's lectures		ed	0	0	0	0	2	7	12	4.48	891/1	568	4.21	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.48
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	1				715/1				4.70	4.64	
		erial presented			0	0	0	1	5				1173/1				4.28	4.20	
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	5			4.38	851/1			4.43		4.20	
		techniques enh			1	3	2	0	6	3	6	3.65	981/1					3.86	3.65
		Discuss			_					_									
		ussions contribu			5	0	0	0	2			4.56	,			4.28	4.08	3.86	4.56
		nts actively enc			4	0	0	1	1			4.53				4.57	4.29	4.03	
		ctor encourage f		discussion	5	0	0	1	2				771/1		4.31		4.30	4.01	
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	stul		4	1	1	1	2	Τ	11	4.25	342/	948	3.98	4.10	3.95	3.75	4.25
		Laborat	ory																
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab repo	rts clearly	specified	20	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	555	1.33	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
		Seminar																	
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made			19	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/	288	1.86	2.95	3.68	3.54	****
5 Did o	conferences	Field W s help you carry		ativities	19	1	0	1	0	0	Λ	2 00	****/	312	2 80	2 48	3 68	2 51	***
J. DIG C	conter ences	s help you carry	out field a	CCIVICIES	10	1	U	1	U	U	U	2.00	/	J12	2.00	2.10	3.00	3.31	
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	n										
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA	Exp	ected Grades				Rea	asons	;				Тур	oe e			Majors	}
00-27	 2	0.00-0.99	0	A 3					or Ma			2	 Grad			0	Majo		1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9		Ke(4utr.	=u 1(ot IMG	ישטני	o I		Grad	ualt	=	U	ria JC) <u> </u>	Τ
26-33 56-83	4	2.00-2.99	3	в 9 С 7		Ger	nera:	1				0	Unde	r-ar	rad ?	1	Non-	-major	20
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	2	D 0		GCI	c. u.	-				•	JIIGE	- 91		-	14011	٠٠٠٠ م٠٠٠٠	20
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	####	- N	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	rh
				P 0											es to b				
				I 0		Oth	her					8	-						
				? 0															

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0101 Title

INT REV ELEM SPANISH

Instructor: NASH, LYLE

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 19

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1559 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equei	ncie	S		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	_	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne		s from this course	0	0	0	0	5	10	4	3.95	1236/1649	4.05	4.34	4.28	4.11	3.95
		ctor make clear th		0	0	0	2	6	4	7		1279/1648			4.23		3.84
			the expected goals	0	0	0	2	6	5	6		1097/1375	3.64	4.42			3.79
		uations reflect th		0	0	0	3	4	5	7		1236/1595		4.29	4.20	4.03	3.84
			e to what you learned	0	3	2	3	4	6	1		1430/1533		4.16		3.87	
			ite to what you learned	0	3	1	1	3	7			1119/1512		4.19	4.10	3.86	3.75
		g system clearly e		0	0	1	4	7	4	3	3.21	1493/1623	3.57	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.21
		was class cancell	-	0	0	0	0	0	12			1317/1646		4.59	4.69	4.67	4.37
	-		teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	5	8	3	3.76	1184/1621		4.14	4.06	3.96	3.76
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	actor's lectures v	well prepared	2	0	0	1	4	6	6	4.00	1279/1568	4.07	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.00
			ted in the subject	2	0	0	0	0				355/1572		4.79			
			and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	3	6			1073/1564		4.28	4.28		4.12
		es contribute to v		2	0	0	0	2	6			818/1559		4.43	4.29	4.20	
			nce your understanding	2	6	1	2	4	2			1183/1352					
J. 214 44		r occiminated	ioc your andersounding	_	·	_	_	-	_	_	3.10	1100,1001	3.11	3.77	3.70	3.00	3.10
		Discussio	on														
1. Did cl	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn			16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1384	4.00	4.28	4.08	3.86	****
2. Were a	all studer	nts actively encou	raged to participate	16	0	0	0	1	0	2	4.33	****/1382	4.00	4.57	4.29	4.03	****
3. Did th	ne instruc	ctor encourage fa:	ir and open discussion	16	0	0	0	2	1	0	3.33	****/1368	4.14	4.42	4.30	4.01	****
4. Were s	special te	echniques successi	Eul	17	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	****/ 948	3.71	4.10	3.95	3.75	****
		Laborato	cy														
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab report	s clearly specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
		Seminar															
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made o	clear	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****
		Field Wor	ck														
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carry o	out field activities	18	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****
			Freq	ıency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ty	pe			Majors	;	
													- 				
00-27	0) A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2) в 4														
56-83	4		1 C 8		Ger	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	-major	19
84-150	4		D 0								_						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5 F 0		E1	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1				_	ıh
			P 0									respons	es to k	e sign	uficar	ıt	
			I O		Ot	her					2						
			? 1														

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1560

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: AREVALOGUERRERO Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 14 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions				NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank		_	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean	
		General	 I															
1 Did v	ou dain ne	w insights,skil	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	4 14	1076/1649	4.05	4.34	4.28	4.11	4.14
		tor make clear			0	0	0	1	2	8	3		1208/1648		4.31	4.23	4.16	3.93
		estions reflect			0	0	1	2	3	5	3		1208/1375			4.27		3.50
		ations reflect			0	0	1	0	4	5	4		1270/1595		4.29	4.20	4.03	3.79
				what you learned	0	0	0	2	5	1	6	3.79	1036/1533	3.42	4.16	4.04	3.87	3.79
6. Did w	ritten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	3	3	3.31	1356/1512	3.53	4.19	4.10	3.86	3.31
		system clearly		ined	0	0	1	0	4	3	6	3.93	1149/1623	3.57	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.93
		was class cance			0	0	1	0	0	1	12	4.64	1059/1646	4.51	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.64
9. How w	ould you g	rade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	5	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1175/1621	3.77	4.14	4.06	3.96	3.78
		Lecture																
		ctor's lectures			0	0	0	2	1	4	7		1205/1568		4.39	4.43	4.39	4.14
		tor seem intere			0	0	0	1	0	2			1096/1572		4.79	4.70	4.64	4.64
		_		xplained clearly	0	0	0	3	1	4			1200/1564		4.28	4.28		3.93
		s contribute to			0 1	0	1 2	1	2	2	8		1088/1559	4.24	4.43	4.29	4.20	4.07
5. Did a	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi					3	2	1	4	0	3	3.10	1207/1352	3.14	3.97	3.98	3.86	3.10
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	lass discu			what you learned	7	0	0	2	0	1	4	4.00	795/1384	4.00	4.28	4.08	3.86	4.00
2. Were	all studen	ts actively end	courage	d to participate	7	0	0	1	1	2	3	4.00	946/1382	4.00	4.57	4.29	4.03	4.00
3. Did t	he instruc	tor encourage i	air and	d open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	4	4.14	900/1368	4.14	4.42	4.30	4.01	4.14
4. Were	special te	chniques succes	ssful	_	7	0	1	1	1	0	4	3.71	619/ 948	3.71	4.10	3.95	3.75	3.71
		Laborat	cory															
5. Were	requiremen	ts for lab repo	orts cl	early specified	12	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.14	****
		Semina	£															
5. Were	criteria f	or grading made	e clear		13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.54	****
		Field V	Vork															
5. Did c	onferences	help you carry	out f	ield activities	10	1	0	1	0	2	0	3.33	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.51	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	ıtioı	ı									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Ty	pe			Majors	1
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	S	9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55		_ :									_				_			
56-83					Gei	nera:	L				1	Under-g	rad 1	4	Non-	major	14	
84-150											0	шшпп	Maar : '	h			.la	
Grad.	rad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					EΙ	ectiv	/es				0	#### - respons					11
	P 0					∩ +¹	ner					2	respons	es to D	e sign	ıııcan	IL	
	I 0					ULI	161					4						
? 0																		

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0101 Title

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI

Enrollment: 24 Questionnaires: 19 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1561 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions								equer		S			tructor		_		Level	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	·															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	0	0	3	3	2	5	6	3.42	1518/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	3.42
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	3	3	5	7	3.74	1361/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.74
		uestions reflect			0	0	1	1	3	8	6	3.89	1039/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	3.89
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	1	1	2	2	7	6	3.83	1242/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	3.83
				what you learned	0	2	5	1	3	4	4	3.06	1432/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.06
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contri	bute to	o what you learned	0	0	2	3	5	4	5	3.37	1334/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.37
		g system clearly		ined	1	0	5	1	2	2	8	3.39	1442/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	3.39
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	13			1356/1646		4.59	4.69	4.63	4.32
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	ll teac	hing effectiveness	6	0	0	0	4	7	2	3.85	1114/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	3.85
		Lecture																
		uctor's lectures			3	0	4	1	2	6	3	3.19	1502/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.19
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clear					0	1	0	0	4	11	4.50	1241/1572		4.79	4.70	4.73	4.50
			3	0	3	2	2	6	3		1460/1564		4.28	4.28	4.27	3.25		
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned					0	3	1	4	1	7		1370/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	3.50
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin					5	2	1	2	3	2	3.20	1177/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.20
		Discuss																
				what you learned	9	0	1	1	5	2	1		1248/1384		4.28	4.08	3.99	3.10
		-	_	d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	455/1382		4.57	4.29	4.19	4.70
		_		d open discussion	9	0	0	0 1	0 4	4	6	4.60	579/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.60
4. were s	special te	echniques succes	ssiui		9	1	U	Τ	4	1	3	3.67	645/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	3.67
_		Seminar	=					_										
5. Were c	riteria 1	for grading made	e clear		17	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
1 1		Field W					_		•						0.40			
5. Did co	nierences	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	18	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Credits E	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	8
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4							ed fo	or M	 ajor	 s 1	.1	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	6	1.00-1.99	0	В 6						J								
56-83	6-83 2 2.00-2.99 2 C 6							L				2	Under-g	rad 1	.9	Non-	major	19
84-150	2	D 1													-			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
	P 1												respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
	F 0		Ele	ectiv	/es				0						jh			

Other

3

I 0

0

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0201 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I uctor: SHORKEY, CATALI

Instructor: SHOR Enrollment: 23
Ouestionnaires: 19

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Fall 2008

Page 1562 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

~				~										
			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	0	1	6	11	4.37	830/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.37
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	10	4.32	825/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.32
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	4.63	432/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.63
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	352/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	3	0	5	4	6	3.56	1214/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	2	2	6	8	4.11	826/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	321/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	0	2	8	8	4.33	595/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.33
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	3	6	9	4.21	1153/1568		4.39	4.43	4.39	4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	2	16	4.79	876/1572		4.79	4.70	4.73	4.79
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	929/1564		4.28	4.28	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	3	12	4.37	871/1559		4.43	4.29	4.33	4.37
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	6	4	6	3.72	935/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.72
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	3	2		4.00	795/1384		4.28	4.08	3.99	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	740/1382		4.57	4.29	4.19	4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	654/1368		4.42	4.30	4.21	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	12	1	0	0	1	3	2	4.17	380/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.17
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	Ο	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	2 75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
5. Here effected for grading made effect	Τ,	U	_	5	5	_	O	2.50	, 200	2.75	2.75	3.00	3.03	
Field Work														

Frequency Distribution

5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 1 0 0 1 0 2.50 ****/ 312 1.81 2.48 3.68 3.59 ****

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 А	8	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	9						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				2	Λ						

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Title MESSICK, ROSALI Instructor:

Enrollment: 23 Fall 2008

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Page 1563 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questionnaires:	17	Student (Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions							_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_		Level		
		Questions	; 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5 	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil		this course	1	0	5	2	2	4	3	2.88	1622/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	2.88
		ctor make clear			1	0	6	2	3	2	3		1628/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	2.63
		uestions reflect			1	0	4	4	0	2	6	3.13	1315/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	3.13
	_	uations reflect		_	1	0	2	3	3	4	4	3.31	1478/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	3.31
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to w	hat you learned	1	3	3	0	3	4	3	3.31	1347/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.31
6. Did wr	ritten as	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	1	0	4	3	1	5	3	3.00	1428/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.00
7. Was th	ne grading	g system clearly	explai	ned	1	0	4	3	4	2	3	2.81	1569/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	2.81
8. How ma	any times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	9	7	4.44	1258/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.44
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overal	l teach	ing effectiveness	4	2	2	2	2	5	0	2.91	1535/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	2.91
		Lecture	2															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures	well p	repared	2	0	6	1	5	2	1	2.40	1558/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	2.40
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem intere	sted in	the subject	1	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	1297/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.44
3. Was le	ecture mat	terial presented	l and ex	plained clearly	1	0	4	4	5	2	1	2.50	1547/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	2.50
		es contribute to			1 2	0 4	4	2	3	4	3		1479/1559			4.29	4.33	3.00
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understand						4	1	2	1	3	2.82	1268/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	2.82
		Discuss	sion															
1. Did cl	Discussion Did class discussions contribute to what you learn					0	1	2	4	2	1	3.00	1254/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.00
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively enc	ouraged	l to participate	7	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	799/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.30
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage f	air and	l open discussion	7	0	0	3	1	1	5	3.80	1071/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	3.80
4. Were s	special to	echniques succes	sful		7	0	1	1	2	1	5	3.80	578/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	3.80
		Laborat	ory															
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab repo	rts cle	early specified	12	0	3	0	2	0	0	1.80	532/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	1.80
		Seminar	:															
5. Were o	criteria :	for grading made	clear		13	2	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	onference	s help you carry	out fi	eld activities	11	0	5	0	1	0	0	1.33	307/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	1.33
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	;			Ty	pe			Majors	l
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	S	9	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 7		~		,				0	TT 3		7	3-7		1 17
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C 4		Ge	nera	Т				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	-major	17
84-150	4-150 4 3.00-3.49 4 D 0 arad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0					m.7						0	шшшш -	Maa +	barra -			.la
Grau.						БŢ	ecti	ves				U	#### - 1 respons				_	11
	P 0					0+	her					6	respons	es co L	e sign	ıııcdı	10	
	I 0 2 1					UL.	11CT					•						
				; т														

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Title Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1564 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

					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	vou gain ne	ew insights,skil		his course	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	484/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.63
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	2	14	4.88	168/1648	4.33		4.23	4.25	4.88
		uestions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	296/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.75
4. Did	other eval	uations reflect	the expec	ted goals	0	1	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	321/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.67
5. Did a	assigned re	eadings contribu	ite to wha	at you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	6	3.93	885/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.93
6. Did v	written ass	signments contri	bute to w	what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	3	10	4.53	359/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.53
7. Was	the grading	g system clearly	explaine	ed	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	502/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.50
8. How t	many times	was class cance	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1646		4.59	4.69	4.63	
9. How v	would you	grade the overal	l teachin	ng effectiveness	1	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	234/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.67
		Lecture	1															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lectures	_	epared	2	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	554/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.71
		ctor seem intere	_	-	2	0	0	0	0				473/1572	4.79		4.70	4.73	
		terial presented			2	0	0	0	0				406/1564	4.23		4.28	4.27	
					2	0	0	0	0	3		4.79		4.39		4.29	4.33	4.79
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi				2	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43					4.07	4.43
	Discussion																	
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned			11	0	0	0	0	0	5		1/1384		4.28	4.08	3.99	5.00	
		nts actively enc			11	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	5.00
		ctor encourage f		pen discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1368	4.56		4.30	4.21	
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	sful		11	1	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	5.00
		Laborat	orv															
5. Were	requiremen	nts for lab repo	_	ly specified	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	****
		Seminar			1.4	•	-	•	0	-	0	0 50	****	0 55	0.05	2 60	2 65	ale ale ale ale
5. Were	criteria i	for grading made	clear		14	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
		Field W	lork															
5. Did	conferences	s help you carry		d activities	14	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****
				_														
				Frequ	lency	Dist	tribi	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade								Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27	·			 A 5					or Ma			1	Graduate		0	Majo		0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	А 5 В 7		Ke(4utr.	EU I	ı ı™d	JOE	a I	_	Gradual.	=	J	Ma JC) <u> </u>	U
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-q	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16
84-150					001	u.	-				•	onaci gi		. •	1,011			
Grad.					Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enoua	h	
	P 0											-	response					
	I 0					Oth	ner					4			3			
	? 0																	

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: COYNE, MARIA

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1565 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	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		om this course	0	0	0	0	1	5	14	4.65	446/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.65
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	5	14	4.74	281/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.74
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95		4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	
	_	uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	3	17	4.85	162/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.85
				what you learned	0	2	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	366/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.50
				o what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	5	13	4.55	345/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.55
7. Was th	e gradino	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	0	6	14	4.70	284/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.70
	-	was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	8	12	4.60	1103/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.60
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	4	1	1	0	1	5	8	4.27	676/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.27
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instru	uctor's lecture		prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	13	4.58	767/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.58
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2	17	4.89	615/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.89
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	3	15	4.74	374/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.74
					1	0	0	0	0	4	15	4.79	347/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.79
	d the lectures contribute to what you learned d audiovisual techniques enhance your understa					0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	303/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	
		_	_	_														
ו הנת ו		Discus			0	0	0	0	0	0	10	F 00	1 /1 2 0 4	4 1 5	4 20	4 00	2 00	г оо
	id class discussions contribute to what you learnere all students actively encouraged to participa				8 8	0	0	0	0	0 2	12 10	5.00 4.83	1/1384 312/1382	4.15 4.70	4.28 4.57	4.08	3.99 4.19	5.00 4.83
		_	_	ed to participate and open discussion		0	0	0	0	1	11	4.83		4.70		4.29	4.19	
		echniques succe		id open discussion	8 8	0	0	0	1	3	8	4.58	237/1368 176/ 948	4.28	4.42 4.10	3.95	3.89	
		- 1																
5. Were r	eguiremer	Labora nts for lab rep	-	early specified	18	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	****
J. MOLO 1	04411001	102 101 102 10p	0100 01	Jean Programme		Ü	Ü	_	Ü	Ü	_	3.30	, 333	1.00	2.50	1.27	1.00	
		Semina:			1-	4	0	0	•	-	0	4 00	****	0 55	0 05	2 60	2 65	ale ale ale ale
5. Were c	riteria i	for grading made	e clear		15	4	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
		Field																
5. Did co	nferences	s help you carr	y out f	ield activities	12	1	2	2	2	1	0	2.29	288/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	2.29
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	redits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Gra							Rea	asons				Туј	pe			Majors	;
00 27												1						
00-27	0 1	0.00-0.99	0 0	A 3 B 12		ке	quire	ea io	or Ma	jor	s I	. 1	Graduat	9	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	_	1.00-1.99	0 4			C c ·	nera:	1				1	IIndox	~~d ^	0	N	ma i a	20
56-83 84-150	3 6	2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	4	C 3		Gei	nera.	L				1	Under-g	Lau 2	0	NON-	-major	20
84-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	D 0 F 0		רם.	ectiv	700				0	#### - I	Meana +	hara a	ro not	enous	rh
Grau.	U	3.30-4.00	4	P 0		E16	=CLI'	v = 5				U	response				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					4	T CPFOIIP	-6 LO L	c argi.	ııııcaı	10	
				5 0		OCI	101					-						
				; U														

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0601 INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Title Instructor: NASH, LYLE

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 15

Page 1566 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

Questions					NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General	 I															
1 Did vo	n gain n	ew insights,skil	=	m this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	871/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.33
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	8	6	4.33	797/1648		4.31	4.23	4.25	4.33
		uestions reflect		1 3	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	895/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.13
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	0	0	0	3	3	9	4.40	636/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.40
				what you learned	1	1	1	1	3	7	1		1276/1533		4.16	4.04	4.04	3.46
				o what you learned	1	0	2	0	4	6	2	3.43	1309/1512		4.19	4.10	4.14	3.43
		g system clearly			1	0	0	1	2	6	5	4.07	994/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.07
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00
	-			hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	1	7	4	4.25	687/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.25
		Lecture	9															
1. Were th	he instr	uctor's lectures	s well	prepared	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	755/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.58
2. Did the	e instru	ctor seem intere	ested i	n the subject	3	0	0	0	0	0	12	5.00	1/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	5.00
3. Was le	cture ma	terial presented	d and e	explained clearly	3	0	0	1	0	6	5	4.25	939/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.25
4. Did the	e lectur	es contribute to	what	you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	7	4.58	607/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.58
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				3	5	1	1	2	1	2	3.29	1149/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.29
		Discuss																
				what you learned	12	0	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	****/1384			4.08	3.99	****
				d to participate	12	0	0	0	0	1	2		****/1382		4.57	4.29	4.19	****
				d open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	0	2		****/1368		4.42	4.30	4.21	****
4. Were s	pecial t	echniques succes	ssful		12	1	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	****
		Field W																
5. Did co	nference	s help you carry	out f	ield activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dist	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	}			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 3		Red	quir	ed f	or Ma	jor	s 1	.0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В 8			-			_						3 -		
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 3		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	5	Non-	major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Otl	ner					5	_		_			
? 0																		

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU

Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1567 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	equer	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	e Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect	
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 L															
1. Did you	u gain new	insights,ski		m this course	2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	130/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.93
		or make clear			2	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	362/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.67
3. Did the	e exam que	stions reflect	the ex	xpected goals	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	192/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.87
4. Did oth	her evalua	tions reflect	the exp	pected goals	2	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	254/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.73
5. Did ass	signed rea	dings contribu	ite to i	what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	6	6	4.07	774/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.07
6. Did wr	itten assi	gnments contri	ibute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	12	4.63	294/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.63
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	expla:	ined -	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	169/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.80
8. How man	ny times w	as class cance	elled		2	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	465/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.93
9. How wor	uld you gr	ade the overal	ll teacl	ning effectiveness	8	0	0	0	0	4	5	4.56	331/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.56
		Lecture	2															
1. Were th	he instruc	tor's lectures		prepared	3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	196/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.93
					3	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/1572		4.79	4.70	4.73	5.00
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clea: Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		-	3	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	216/1564		4.28	4.28	4.27	4.86	
					3	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	164/1559		4.43	4.29		4.93
				our understanding	3	1	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	415/1352				4.07	
		Discus																
1 544 -1.		Jan 1	7	0	0	0	0	2	7	4 70	202/1204	4 1 5	4 20	4 00	2 00	4 70		
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learn Were all students actively encouraged to participa				7	0	0	0	0	3 0	10	4.70	302/1384		4.28	4.08	3.99 4.19	4.70 5.00
		_	_			-	-	-	-	-		5.00	1/1382		4.57	4.29		
				d open discussion	7 7	0 1	0	0	2	0 1	8	4.60	579/1368		4.42	4.30	4.21	
4. were s	pecial tec	hniques succes	ssiui		/	1	U	U	U	Т	8	4.89	93/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.89
		Laborat	-															
			_	f the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 221		4.38	4.16	4.45	****
				ground information	16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 243		4.69	4.12	4.47	****
5. Were re	equirement	s for lab repo	orts cle	early specified	13	0	2	1	1	0	0	1.75	****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	****
		Semina	=															
5. Were c	riteria fo	r grading made	e clear		12	2	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
		Field V	Vork															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out f	ield activities	13	1	1	2	0	0	0	1.67	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****
		Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	utior	1											
Credits Ea	Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Тъ	ре			Majors				
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s	7	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		~		,				-	1	, .				1.6
56-83						Ger	nera	T				1	Under-g	rad 1	L7	Non-	-major	16
84-150												0		3.6	.1			1-
Grad.						F.T.	ecti	ves				0	#### -				_	111
	P 0					O+1						7	respons	es to k	oe sign	ııııcar	1T	
	3 0 I 0						ner					/						
? 0																		

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 16

Fall 2008

Page 1568 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionn	aire
---------	--------	------------	-----------	------

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

	Frequencies I		Instructor		Course Dept		pt 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	1	1	6	6	3.81	1343/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	3.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	5	6	3.94	1197/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	3.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	6	8	4.31	753/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.31
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	5	4	6	4.07	1032/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.07
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	3	1	3	2	7	3.56	1207/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	1	5	3	5	3.50	1266/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13	957/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	15	1	4.06	1521/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	2	6	4	4.00	914/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.00
Lecture														
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 	2	0	0	0	4	3	7		1153/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43		4.21
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	4	10		1003/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70		4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	2	3	4	5		1246/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.86
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	2	4	7		1045/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29		4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	0	0	3	5	4	4.08	644/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.08
Discussion	1.0	0	^	^	2	1	_	2 02	001/1204	4 1 5	4 00	4 00	2 00	2 02
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	921/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	10	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	483/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	10	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	796/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30		4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	10	0	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	564/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	3.83
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	4 50	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	14	0	0	0	0	1	1			****	4.69	4.12	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 212	****	5.00	4.12	4.62	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	14	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.64	***
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	14	0	1	0	0	0	1		****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	***
J. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	11	O		U	U	U		3.00	/ 555	1.55	2.50	4.20	1.55	
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	****	4.39	4.54	3.75	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 85	****	4.20	4.47	3.33	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	14	1	0	0	0	0	1			****	4.23	4.43	3.67	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 92	****	4.32		5.00	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	1	1	1	0	1	2.75	246/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	2.75
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.93	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	14	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.50	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.05	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	14	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.49	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	3.66	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	14	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****
Self Paced		_	_	_										
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	1	0	1		****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	14	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.72	***

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: Questionnaires: 16

Enrollment:

19

COLOMBO, LAURA

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1568 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	 6	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	16
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County

Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 11

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1569

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

responses to be significant

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 M			Inst	instructor Course D		Dept UMBC Level		Sect					
		Questions	;		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1 Did vo	u dain ne	ew insights,skil		om this course	2	0	0	0	Λ	1	g	4.89	203/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.89
		ctor make clear			2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	244/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.78
		estions reflect			2	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	271/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.78
		ations reflect			2	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	362/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.63
				what you learned	2	1	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	272/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.63
	-	-		to what you learned	2	1	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	194/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.75
		system clearly		-	2	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	321/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.67
		was class cance	_		2	0	0	0	0	7	2	4.22	1419/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69		4.22
	-			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	270/1621		4.14	4.06		4.63
		Lecture																
1 Word t	ho inatro	actor's lectures		propared	2	0	0	0	Λ	2	6	4.75	480/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.75
					3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	931/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.75
	 Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 					0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	342/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.75
		es contribute to			3	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	390/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.75
				your understanding	3	2	0	1	1	2	2	3.83	860/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	3.83
		Discuss						•	•		_	- 00			4 00			****
				what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1384		4.28	4.08	3.99	****
		-	_	ed to participate	9	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1382		4.57	4.29	4.19	****
		_		nd open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	U T	1		****/1368 ****/ 948		4.42 4.10	4.30	4.21	****
4. were s	pecial te	echniques succes	siui		9	U	U	U	1	U	Τ	4.00	^^^^/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	
	F						tribu	ution	1									
Credits E	dits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
		0 00 0 00																1
00-27 28-55	0	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99	0 1	A 2 B 4		кес	quire	ea fo	or Ma	ajors		5	Graduat	=	0	Majo	or.	T
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 2	Conoral						0	Under-q	rad 1	1	Non	major	10	
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	3	D 0	General							U	onder-g.	Lau I		MOI1-	iiia jul	TO
Grad.	0	3.50-3.49	1	Б 0 F 0	Floatiwoa							0	#### _ 1	Meane t	here a	re not	- anouio	rh
Grau.	U	3.50-4.00	Τ.	r U	Electives							U	#### - 1	- Means there are not eno				ltt

Other

Ρ

Ι

0

0

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Title Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU

Enrollment: 26 Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1570 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

Ouestions				quer		5	-		ructor	Course	_	UMBC		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	2	16	4.52	617/1649	4.30	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.52
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	3	16	4.67	362/1648	4.33	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	83/1375	4.50	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.95
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	17	4.81	192/1595	4.41	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.81
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	2	3	4	4	3	5	3.16	1404/1533	3.79	4.16	4.04	4.04	3.16
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	5	9	7	4.10	839/1512	4.06	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	1	3	16	4.75	220/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.75
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	5.00	1/1646	4.62	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	6	11	4.47	415/1621	4.21	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.47
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	731/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	1	2	17	4.80	840/1572	4.79	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	2	7	9	4.26	929/1564	4.23	4.28	4.28	4.27	4.26
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	2	3	14	4.50	695/1559	4.39	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	2	0	0	4	7	6	4.12	624/1352	3.95	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.12
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	2	3	1	3.83	921/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	15	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	312/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	15	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	522/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.67
4. Were special techniques successful	14	1	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	380/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.17
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.07	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 30	****	****	4.16	1.50	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 41	****	****	4.43	3.50	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 24	****	****	4.42	2.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	3.72	****
* 1.5									,					

Credits	Earned	Earned Cum. GPA			d Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	21	Non-major	19
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	2	_			
				?	1						

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: COYNE, MARIA

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 20

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1571 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Ouestions	NR	NA	Fre		ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	-		Level Mean	
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	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 2 5	3 3 1 1 1 4	16 17 19 17 13	4.75 4.85 4.95 4.75 4.42 4.60	236/1595	4.33 4.50	4.34 4.31 4.42 4.29 4.16 4.19		4.29 4.25 4.37 4.22 4.04 4.14	4.75 4.42
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0 0 6	0 0 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 0 3	4 10 3	10	4.50	395/1623 1193/1646 632/1621		4.59	4.16 4.69 4.06	4.21 4.63 4.01	4.50
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	1 1 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 0 1 1	1 0 1	18 17	4.95 4.89	517/1568 355/1572 178/1564 272/1559 263/1352	4.39	4.28 4.43		4.39 4.73 4.27 4.33 4.07	4.89 4.84
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 4. Were special techniques successful	6 6 6	0 0 0 3	0 0 0 0	1 0 0	1 1 1 2	1 2 0 3	11 13	4.71 4.86	394/1384 435/1382 316/1368 297/ 948	4.70 4.56	4.57 4.42	4.08 4.29 4.30 3.95	3.99 4.19 4.21 3.89	4.86
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	18	0	2	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	***
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	1	3	0	0	1	0	1.75	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	17	0	1	1	0	1	0	2.33	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	utior	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
00-27		Ger	- neral	1	or Ma	ijor		4 0 0 3	Graduato Under-g: #### - I responso	rad 2 Means t		re not	major enoug	0 20 h

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: COYNE, MARIA

Enrollment: 27
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1572 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did	vou gain	General new insights,skil		this course	0	0	1	Ω	1	4	10	4.38	816/1649	4.30	4.34	4 28	4.29	4.38
		uctor make clear			0	0	1	0	0	5	10	4.44		4.33		4.23	4.25	4.44
		questions reflect			0	0	0	0	0	5		4.69	,	4.50		4.27		
		luations reflect	_	-	1	0	0	1	2	5	7		890/1595		4.29	4.20	4.22	4.20
		readings contribu			0	0	1	2	2	5	6		1006/1533		4.16	4.04	4.04	3.81
		ssignments contri			1	0	1	0	2	4	8		755/1512		4.19	4.10	4.14	
		ng system clearly			0	0	1	2	2				999/1623	4.26	4.08	4.16	4.21	
		s was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	10	6		1310/1646		4.59	4.69	4.63	
	-	grade the overal		ng effectiveness	4	0	0	1	1	4	6		687/1621					
1 Wom	o tho inat	Lecture ructor's lectures	-	onawad	1	0	1	0	0	5	9	4.40	983/1568	4.28	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.40
		uctor seem intere	_	-	1	0	0	0	1				967/1572			4.43	4.73	
		aterial presented			1	0	1	0	0			4.73				4.70	4.73	
		res contribute to			1	0	0	0	2				662/1559	4.39		4.29	4.33	
					2	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43					4.07	
J. DIG	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding				2	U	1	U	U	-	,	1.13	3/9/1332	3.75	3.91	3.90	1.07	1.13
	Discussion																	
1. Did	1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned					0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	437/1384	4.15	4.28	4.08	3.99	4.50
2. Were	e all stud	ents actively end	couraged	to participate	8	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	521/1382	4.70	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.63
3. Did	the instr	uctor encourage f	air and	open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	771/1368	4.56	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.38
4. Were	e special	techniques succes	ssful		8	2	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	310/ 948	4.28	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.33
		Laborat	Oru															
5. Were	e requirem	ents for lab repo	_	rly specified	12	0	3	1	0	0	0	1.25	552/ 555	1.53	2.56	4.29	4.33	1.25
J	0 1040110	ones for fax repo	7100 0100	II, prodilion		Ü	J	_	Ü	Ū	Ü	1.25	332, 333	1.55	2.50	1.27	1.55	1.20
		Seminar	-															
5. Were	e criteria	for grading made	e clear		13	1	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	****/ 288	2.75	2.95	3.68	3.65	****
		Field W	Jorde															
5. Did	conferenc	es help you carry		ld activities	14	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 312	1.81	2.48	3.68	3.59	****
J. 214	00112 02 0110	ob noip you ourly	040 110	14 4001710105		_	_	ŭ	Ü	Ū	Ü	1.00	, 311	1.01	2.10	3.00	3.33	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credita	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grade							Rea	asons	5			Туј	pe			Majors	
	·																	
00-27						Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	s 1	0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	0
28-55								_										
56-83					Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	-major	16	
	84-150 4 3.00-3.49 2 D 0											0			,			,
Grad.	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0				Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					n	
	P 0					O+1	0.00					2	respons	es to D	e sign	ıırıcar	lL	
	I 0					UEI	her					4						
	? 1																	

Course-Section: SPAN 201H 0101 University of Maryland Page 1573 Title Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009 INTERM SPAN I - HONORS Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA

Enrollment: 5 Questionnaires: 5

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

						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	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	776/1649	4.40	4.34	4.28	4.29	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals			0	0	1	1	3	4.40	702/1648	4.40	4.31	4.23	4.25	4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	233/1375	4.80	4.42	4.27	4.37	4.80
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	636/1595	4.40	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	476/1533	4.40	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.40
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1089/1512	3.80	4.19	4.10	4.14	3.80
7. Was the grading system clearly explained			0	0	0	2	3	4.60	395/1623	4.60	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.60
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4.20	1440/1646	4.20	4.59	4.69	4.63	4.20
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	754/1621	4.20	4.14	4.06	4.01	4.20
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4.40	983/1568	4.40	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	840/1572		4.79	4.70	4.73	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly		0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	1001/1564		4.28	4.28	4.27	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned		0	0	0	1	0	4	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.43	4.29	4.33	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	0	0	0	2	1	4.33	457/1352		3.97	3.98	4.07	4.33

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

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0101 Title

University of Maryland INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: VAL, ADRIANA

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 10

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1574 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			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	Ω	2	5	2	3 70	1402/1649	3.70	4.34	4.28	4.29	3.70
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	966/1648		4.31	4.23	4.25	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	6	0	0	1	1	2	4.25	806/1375		4.42	4.27	4.37	4.25
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	3	5	4.20	890/1595	4.20	4.29	4.20	4.22	4.20
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	1	3	4	4.00	815/1533	4.00	4.16	4.04	4.04	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learn	ed 0	0	1	0	0	3	6	4.30	627/1512	4.30	4.19	4.10	4.14	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	757/1623	4.30	4.08	4.16	4.21	4.30
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1646	5.00	4.59	4.69	4.63	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivene	ss 5	0	1	0	2	0	2	3.40	1405/1621	3.40	4.14	4.06	4.01	3.40
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	1	0	0	4	5	4.20	1169/1568	4.20	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	1241/1572	4.50	4.79	4.70	4.73	4.50
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	1	0	2	4	3	3.80	1273/1564	3.80	4.28	4.28	4.27	3.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	1	2	4	2	3.50	1370/1559	3.50	4.43	4.29	4.33	3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	g 0	0	0	1	0	4	5	4.30	482/1352	4.30	3.97	3.98	4.07	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	1	2	2	3	3.88	901/1384	3.88	4.28	4.08	3.99	3.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.57	4.29	4.19	4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	n 2	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	426/1368	4.75	4.42	4.30	4.21	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	3	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.43	265/ 948	4.43	4.10	3.95	3.89	4.43
Laboratory														
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	9	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.33	****
Fr	equency	7 Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Туј	pe			Majors	

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

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED SPANISH I Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST

FEB 11, 2009 Baltimore County Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

7

Page 1575

Enrollment:	19	
Questionnaires:	13	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Ι

?

0

0

Ouestions						_	ncies	5			ructor		_		Level			
		Questions	5		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General																
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,skil	=	this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	803/1649	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.38
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	427/1648	3.82	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.62
		uestions reflect			1	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	149/1375	3.92	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.92
4. Did ot	her evalu	uations reflect	the expe	cted goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	106/1595	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.92
5. Did as	ssigned re	eadings contribu	ite to wh	at you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	4.46	410/1533	3.95	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.46
6. Did wr	ritten ass	signments contri	bute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	302/1512	4.03	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.62
		g system clearly		ied	0	0	0	0	1	3	9		382/1623		4.08	4.16	4.08	4.62
		was class cance			0	0	0	0	0	8			1302/1646		4.59	4.69	4.67	4.38
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overal	ll teachi	ng effectiveness	2	1	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	511/1621	3.93	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.40
		Lecture	<u> </u>															
		actor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	330/1568	4.18	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.85
		ctor seem intere			0	0	0	0	0	2	11	4.85	740/1572	4.70	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.85
		terial presented			0	0	0	0	1	1	11		326/1564		4.28	4.28	4.25	4.77
		es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	3	9	4.62	573/1559		4.43	4.29	4.23	4.62
5. Did au	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi			ır understanding	0	1	0	1	1	5	5	4.17	582/1352	4.08	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.17
		Discuss																
		ussions contribu		2	3	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	541/1384		4.28	4.08	4.11	4.40
		nts actively end			3	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	243/1382		4.57	4.29	4.37	4.90
				open discussion	3	0	0	0	0 1	0 3	10	5.00	1/1368		4.42	4.30	4.39	5.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succes	ssiul		3	1	Ü	Ü	Τ	3	5	4.44	249/ 948	3.54	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.44
		Laborat	-															
5. Were r	requiremen	nts for lab repo	orts clea	arly specified	11	0	0	0	1	0	1	4.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****
		Seminar	="			•					•							
5. Were	criteria i	for grading made	e clear		12	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	***	2.95	3.68	3.58	****
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 4					Red	auir	ed f	or Ma	aior	 `S	0	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	3
28-55												-		-	-) •		-
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Gei	nera	1				4	Under-g	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	10
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	jh
				P 1									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	nt	
				T 0		0+1	,					_	-		_			

Other

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0201 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED SPANISH I Baltimore County

Instructor: NASH, LYLE Fall 2008

? 3

Enrollment: 20 Questionnaires: 16 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

					Frequencies					ructor	Course	_		Level	Sect			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did yo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski		m this course	1	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	1086/1649	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.13
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor make clear	the ex	pected goals	1	0	6	2	3	0	4	2.60	1630/1648	3.82	4.31	4.23	4.18	2.60
3. Did th	ne exam qu	uestions reflec	t the e	xpected goals	2	0	6	2	3	1	2	2.36	1369/1375	3.92	4.42	4.27	4.22	2.36
4. Did ot	her eval	uations reflect	the ex	pected goals	1	1	3	1	3	5	2	3.14	1516/1595	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.21	3.14
5. Did as	signed re	eadings contrib	ute to	what you learned	1	0	1	3	1	4	6	3.73	1084/1533	3.95	4.16	4.04	4.05	3.73
6. Did wr	itten as	signments contr	ibute t	o what you learned	1	0	2	1	5	2	5	3.47	1287/1512	4.03	4.19	4.10	4.11	3.47
7. Was th	e grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	1	0	4	3	3	3	2	2.73	1582/1623	3.81	4.08	4.16	4.08	2.73
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	15	0	4.00	1544/1646	4.35	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.00
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	8	0	1	0	2	4	1	3.50	1345/1621	3.93	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.50
		Lectur	e															
1. Were t	he instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	6	0	1	0	4	2	3	3.60	1440/1568	4.18	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.60
		ctor seem inter			4	0	0	1	1	2	8	4.42	1313/1572	4.70	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.42
3. Was le	cture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	5	0	0	2	6	1	2	3.27	1455/1564	4.10	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.27
4. Did th	e lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	5	0	2	0	2	2	5	3.73	1295/1559	4.23	4.43	4.29	4.23	3.73
5. Did au	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned . Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandi:			our understanding	4	10	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/1352	4.08	3.97	3.98	3.97	****
		Discus	sion															
1. Did cl	ass disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	8	0	0	3	1	1	3	3.50	1081/1384	4.04	4.28	4.08	4.11	3.50
2. Were a	ıll stude	nts actively en	courage	d to participate	8	0	0	1	2	1	4	4.00	946/1382	4.56	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.00
				d open discussion	8	0	0	0	4	0	4	4.00	948/1368	4.59	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.00
4. Were s	special te	echniques succe	ssful	-	9	1	3	1	0	2	0	2.17	933/ 948	3.54	4.10	3.95	4.00	2.17
				Frequ	ıency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	'arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Pe:	ason	a			Ту	ne			Majors	•
																		,
00-27	4	0.00-0.99	0	A 5		Re	quir	ed fo	or M	ajors	\$	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B 2		_							1	, .	_			
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C 5		Ge	nera	T				2	Under-g	rad 1	.6	Non-	major	13
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	2	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0	Electives						3	#### - 1					jh	
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
				Ι 0		Other						8						

Page 1576

FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Baltimore County

Fall 2008

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0301

15

ADVANCED SPANISH I

MEDINA, ADRIANA

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

84-150

Grad.

1

0

3.00-3.49

3.50-4.00

1

5

D

F

Ρ

Ι

?

0

0

0

0

1

Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Page 1577 FEB 11, 2009

Job IRBR3029

- Means there are not enough

responses to be significant

Student	Course	Eva	luation	Oue	st.i	onnai	re

	Ouestions							equer	ncies	S			ructor	Course	_	-	Level	Sect
		Question	ıs		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did	you gain n	new insights,ski	lls fro	om this course	0	0	1	1	1	3	6	4.00	1183/1649	4.17	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.00
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	2	5	5	4.25	897/1648	3.82	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.25
		questions reflec			0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	546/1375	3.92	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.50
		uations reflect			0	0	0	1	2	5	4	4.00	1067/1595	4.02	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.00
5. Did	assigned r	eadings contrib	oute to	what you learned	0	0	1	2	1	4	4	3.67	1139/1533	3.95	4.16	4.04	4.05	3.67
6. Did	written as	signments contr	ribute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	3	4.00	883/1512	4.03	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.00
7. Was	the gradin	ng system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	989/1623	3.81	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.08
8. How	many times	was class cand	celled		0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	1037/1646	4.35	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.67
9. How	would you	grade the overa	all tead	ching effectiveness	2	0	0	1	2	4	3	3.90	1060/1621	3.93	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.90
		Lectur	re															
1. Wer	e the instr	cuctor's lecture	es well	prepared	0	0	0	1	2	4	5	4.08	1243/1568	4.18	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.08
2. Did	the instru	actor seem inter	rested :	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	765/1572	4.70	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.83
3. Was	lecture ma	aterial presente	ed and	explained clearly	0	0	0	1	1	4	6	4.25	939/1564	4.10	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.25
4. Did	the lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	1	1	3	7	4.33	901/1559	4.23	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.33
5. Did	audiovisua	al techniques er	hance y	your understanding	0	1	0	0	3	5	3	4.00	690/1352	4.08	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.00
		Discus	ssion															
1. Did	class disc	cussions contrib	oute to	what you learned	3	0	0	1	1	2	5	4.22	691/1384	4.04	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.22
2. Wer	e all stude	ents actively er	ncourage	ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	373/1382	4.56	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.78
3. Did	the instru	ctor encourage	fair an	nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	403/1368	4.59	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.78
4. Wer	e special t	echniques succe	essful		3	0	0	0	2	5	2	4.00	431/ 948	3.54	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.00
				Frequ	iency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Q	Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grad							Das		_			m				Ma dana	
creait	s £arnea	Cum. GP <i>F</i>	·	Expected Grades				кеа	asons	s 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27		0.00-0.99	0	A 5	Required for Majors				s	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	r	3		
28-55		1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Gei	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.2	Non-	major	9

Electives

9

Other

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0101 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED SPANISH II Baltimore County Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI Fall 2008

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 9

12

University of Maryland Page 1578
Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009
Fall 2008 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Fwaluation	Ouestionnaire	
Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire	

					Frequencies							Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. D	id vou gai	n new insights,ski	_	n this course	1	0	0	0	0	4	4	4.50	644/1649	4.40	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.50
		tructor make clear			1	0	0	0	2	2	4	4.25	897/1648	4.32	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.25
		m questions reflec			1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	443/1375	4.53	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.63
		valuations reflect			1	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	818/1595	4.40	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.25
		d readings contrib			1	0	0	0	2	1	5	4.38	505/1533	4.54	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.38
6. D	id written	assignments contr	ibute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	380/1512	4.30	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.50
7. W	as the gra	ding system clearl	y expla:	ined	1	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	1029/1623	4.00	4.08	4.16	4.08	4.00
8. H	low many ti	mes was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	6	2	4.25	1398/1646	4.63	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.25
9. H	low would y	ou grade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	4	4.29	654/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.29
		Lectur																
		structor's lecture			1	0	0	0	2	4	2		1279/1568		4.39		4.39	
		tructor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	1	7		665/1572	4.81	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.88
		material presente			1	0	0	0	2	2	4		939/1564	3.88	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.25
		tures contribute t			1	0	0	0	0	4	4		695/1559	4.58	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. D	id audiovi	sual techniques en	hance yo	our understanding	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	234/1352	3.81	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.63
		D																
1 5		Discus		3	_	0	^	0	1	^	4	4 42	E00/1204	4 71	4 00	4 00	4 11	4 42
		iscussions contrib			2	0	0	0	1	2 0	4 6	4.43 4.71	520/1384 435/1382	4.71 4.54	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.43 4.71
		udents actively en tructor encourage			2	0	0	0	1	2	4	4.71	732/1368		4.57	4.29	4.37	4.71
		l techniques succe		d open discussion	2	0	0	1	0	2	4	4.43	330/ 948		4.42	3.95	4.39	4.43
4. W	ere specia	i teciliiques succe	SSLUI		2	U	U	Т	U	2	4	4.29	330/ 940	4.31	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.29
				Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									
Cred	lits Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	;
00-		0.00-0.99	1	A 1		Red	quire	ed id	or Ma	ajors	3	1	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	2
28-		1.00-1.99	0	B 5 C 1		G = 1		ı				2	TTrades as		0	Man		7
56-		2.00-2.99	0			Gei	neral	L				2	Under-g	rad	9	Non-	-major	7
84-		3.00-3.49 3.50-4.00	1 0	D 0 F 0		. דקד	ectiv					1	#### - 1	Moona +	homo -			.h
Gra	u. 0	3.50-4.00	U	F 0		r16	ECLI	/es				Т	respons				_	111
				I 0		O+1	her					2	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcaı	10	
				5 U		UCI	net					4						
				; U														

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201 University of Maryland Baltimore County

Title ADVANCED SPANISH II Instructor: BELL, ALAN S

Enrollment: 13 Fall 2008

Page 1579 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Enrollment:	13				
Questionnaires:	10	Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire

Questions		377			ncies		_		ructor		_		Level	
Questions	NR 	NA	1	∠ 	3	4		Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	2	3	5	4.30	912/1649			4.28	4.27	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	702/1648		4.31	4.23		4.40
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	2			617/1375				4.22	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	4			440/1595				4.21	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1			217/1533		4.16	4.04		4.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3			835/1512		4.19	4.10	4.11	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	2			1029/1623			4.16	4.08	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	0		5.00	1/1646		4.59		4.67	
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	4	3	1	3.44	1381/1621	3.87	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.44
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	6	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.75	1401/1568	3.88	4.39	4.43	4.39	3.75
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	6	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	931/1572	4.81	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.75
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	1	0	0	2	1	3.50	1388/1564	3.88	4.28	4.28	4.25	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	6	1	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	512/1559	4.58	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	5	2	0	1	1	1	0	3.00	1219/1352	3.81	3.97	3.98	3.97	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	8	5.00	1/1384	4 71	4.28	4.08	4.11	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	1		4.38			4.57	4.29	4.37	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	3	0	-	4.25	844/1368				4.39	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	2	0	0	1	2	-	4.33						
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	8	0	0	1	1	0	0	2 50	****/ 555	****	2 56	4 20	4 22	****
3. Were requirements for lab reports creatry specified	0	U	U	Τ.	_	U	U	2.50	/ 555		2.50	4.23	4.22	
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	8	1	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	***
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	7	0	0	2	0	1	0	2.67	275/ 312	2.67	2.48	3.68	3.60	2.67
_														
Freq	uency	Dist	cribi	utior	1									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Туј	ре			Majors	
00-27 0 0.00-0.99 0 A 4		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 r	5
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 3			_			J								
56-83 1 2.00-2.99 1 C 1		Ger	nera:	l				0	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	5
84-150 1 3.00-3.49 1 D 0									3				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		$El\epsilon$	ectiv	ves				1	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
Р 0									response	es to b	e sign	ifican	.t	
I 0		Oth	ner					8						
? 1														

Course-Section: SPAN 305 0101

Title SPAN FOR HERITAGE SPAN

TOTE BITH TON HENTING

Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1580 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	anıer	ncies			Tnst	tructor	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	0	0	1	5	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.83
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	195/1648	4.83	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	174/1595	4.83	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.83
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5		142/1512	4.83	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.83
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	3.83	1222/1623	3.83	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1		4.83	782/1646		4.59	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	165/1621	4.75	4.14	4.06	4.02	4.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	344/1568	4.83	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	234/1564	4.83	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	284/1559	4.83	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1352		3.97	3.98	3.97	5.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	342/1382	4.80	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	369/1368	4.80	4.42	4.30	4.39	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	1	0	0	0	1	3		122/ 948		4.10	3.95		4.75
1. Wele apecial teelmiques successiul	_	_	Ü	O	Ü	_	3	1.75	122/ 510	1.75	1.10	3.75	1.00	1.75
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 221	****	4.38	4.16	4.07	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 243	****	4.69	4.12	3.89	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 212	****	5.00	4.40	4.21	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 209	****	****	4.35	4.12	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 555	***	2.56	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 88	***	4.39	4.54	4.63	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	***	4.20	4.47	4.55	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 81	***	4.23	4.43	4.30	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 92	****	4.32	4.35	4.46	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	****
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.06	3.59	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.09	4.21	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 39	****	4.67	4.47	4.43	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 39	****	4.67	4.38	4.32	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.60	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 53	****	5.00	4.30	4.32	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 30	****	****	4.16	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 41	****	****	4.43	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	****	4.42	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.05	****
3. Here there chough proceeds for all the students	J	J	U	U	U	U	_	3.00	, 110		1.13	3.75	1.03	

Course-Section: SPAN 305 0101

Title SPAN FOR HERITAGE SPAN

Instructor: SCH

SCHWARTZ, ANA-M

Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008 Page 1580 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101 Title

ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS

Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 18 University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1581 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions	NR	NA		equer 2	ncies 3	s 4	5		ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0 0	0	0	0	0 2	2 2	16 14	4.89 4.67	203/1649 362/1648	4.89 4.67	4.34 4.31	4.28 4.23	4.27 4.18	4.89 4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0 2	0	0	0	2		4.50	100/1375 497/1595		4.42	4.27	4.22	
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	0 1 1	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 2	4	12	4.65	198/1533 279/1512 416/1623		4.16 4.19 4.08	4.04 4.10 4.16	4.05 4.11 4.08	4.72 4.65 4.59
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1 5	0	0	0	0	16	1	4.06	1525/1646 117/1621	4.06	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.06
Lecture	1	0	0	1	0	4	10	4 50	755 /1560	4.50	4 20	4 42	4 20	4 50
 Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Did the instructor seem interested in the subject Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 	1 1 2	0 0	0 0	1 0 0	0 0 1	0 1	14	4.59 5.00 4.81	755/1568 1/1572 253/1564	5.00 4.81	4.39 4.79 4.28	4.43 4.70 4.28		5.00 4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0 1	0 4	17 12	5.00 4.65	1/1559 221/1352		4.43	4.29 3.98	4.23 3.97	
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7 7	0	0	0	0	1	10 11	4.91 5.00	150/1384 1/1382		4.28 4.57	4.08 4.29	4.11 4.37	4.91 5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4. Were special techniques successful	7 7	0	0 1	0	0	0 2		5.00 4.45	1/1368 242/ 948	5.00 4.45	4.42 4.10		4.39	
Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	17	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****
Seminar 5. Were criteria for grading made clear	16	1	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.58	***
Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	2	0	0	1	0	2.00	****/ 312	****	2.48	3.68	3.60	****
Freq	uency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S 			Ту:	pe 			Majors	
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 13 28-55 2 1.00-1.99 0 B 4			_	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	`s		Graduat		0	Majo		7
56-83			nera: ectiv					2	Under-g:		.8 here a		major	11 rh
P 0 I 0 ? 0		Otl					1	.6	respons				_	

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

Instructor: POGGIO, SARA

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 7

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1582 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		0		.	377		_	ncies		-		tructor	Course	_		Level	Sect	
		Question	s 		NK 	NA		2 	3 	4		Mean	Rank 	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
		w insights,ski			0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.27	5.00
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	862/1648		4.31	4.23	4.18	4.29
	_	estions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	780/1375		4.42	4.27	4.22	4.29
		ations reflect			0	1	0	0	1	4	1		1067/1595		4.29	4.20	4.21	4.00
	-	-		hat you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1533		4.16	4.04	4.05	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	4.14			4.19	4.10	4.11	4.14
		system clearl		ned	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	780/1623		4.08	4.16	4.08	4.29
	-	was class canc			0	0	0	0	1	3	3		1377/1646		4.59	4.69	4.67	4.29
9. How wor	ula you g	grade the overa	II teacn	ing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	1151/1621	3.80	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.80
		Lectur	e															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lecture	s well p	repared	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	387/1568	4.80	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.80
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem inter	ested in	the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	840/1572	4.80	4.79	4.70	4.64	4.80
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presente	d and ex	plained clearly	2	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	780/1564	4.40	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.40
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what y	ou learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	586/1559	4.60	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.60
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance yo	ur understanding	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	556/1352	4.20	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.20
		Discus																
1 സ്ക്കി.			hat you learned	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384	5.00	4.28	4.08	4.11	5.00	
		to participate	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1384		4.57	4.29	4.37	5.00		
				open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	1/1368		4.42	4.30	4.39	5.00
		chniques succe		open discussion	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	4.00	431/ 948		4.10	3.95		4.00
i. Were b	peciai ce	CIMITAGE BUCCE	DDIGI		_	-	Ü	O	_	_	_	1.00	131, 310	1.00	1.10	3.75	1.00	1.00
		Labora	tory															
5. Were re	equiremen	its for lab rep	orts cle	arly specified	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 555	****	2.56	4.29	4.22	****
		Field	Morle															
5. Did com	nferences	help you carr		eld activities	4	1	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	256/ 312	3.00	2.48	3.68	3.60	3.00
			-															
			Frequ	lency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n										
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	;			Ту	pe			Majors	\$	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 6		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	4
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 1		_				J						5 -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 0		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad	7	Non-	major	3
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0									J				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enou	ŗh
	Р 0												respons				_	
				I 0		Ot!	her					6	-					
				? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Course-Section: SPAN 311 0101 Title INTRO TO SPANISH LIT SINNIGEN, JOHN Fall 2008

Instructor: 4

Enrollment: Ouestionnaires: 3

Page 1583 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equei 2	ncies 3	s 4	5	Instr Mean	uctor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1649	5.00	4.34	4.28	4.27	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1648	5.00	4.31	4.23	4.18	5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1375	5.00	4.42	4.27	4.22	5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1595	5.00	4.29	4.20	4.21	5.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5.00	1/1533	5.00	4.16	4.04	4.05	5.00

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1512 5.00 4.19 4.10 4.11 5.00 0 0 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1623 5.00 4.08 4.16 4.08 5.00 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 0 0 1 2 4.67 1037/1646 4.67 4.59 4.69 4.67 4.67 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1621 5.00 4.14 4.06 4.02 5.00

Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared Ω Ω Ω Ω 0 3 5.00 1/1568 5.00 4.39 4.43 4.39 5.00 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 1/1572 5.00 4.79 4.70 4.64 5.00

3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0 3 5.00 1/1564 5.00 4.28 4.28 4.25 5.00 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 0 3 5.00 1/1559 5.00 4.43 4.29 4.23 5.00 0 0 0 0 0 3 5.00 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0 0 0 0 1/1352 5.00 3.97 3.98 3.97 5.00 Discussion

1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/1384 5.00 4.28 4.08 4.11 5.00 2 1 5.00 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0 0 0 0 0 1/1382 5.00 4.57 4.29 4.37 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 0 1/1368 5.00 4.42 4.30 4.39 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 2 0 0 0 0 1 5.00 1/ 948 5.00 4.10 3.95 4.00 5.00

Laboratory 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 0 2.00 522/555 2.00 2.56 4.29 4.22 2.00

Field Work 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 0 0 0 0 1.00 308/312 1.00 2.48 3.68 3.60 1.00 1

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	2	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	2
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	0						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	3	Non-major	1
84-150	2	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	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	3	_			
				2	0						

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

Baltimore County Fall 2008

BELL, ALAN S Instructor:

Enrollment: 6 Questionnaires: 6

Page 1584 FEB 11, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	Evaluation	Questionnaire
---------	--------	------------	---------------

			Fre	equei	ncies	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	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.34	4.28	4.27	4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	1124/1648	4.00	4.31	4.23	4.18	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	4.33	733/1375	4.33	4.42	4.27	4.22	4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	4.17	930/1595	4.17	4.29	4.20	4.21	4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	241/1533	4.67	4.16	4.04	4.05	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	380/1512	4.50	4.19	4.10	4.11	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	3.50	1387/1623	3.50	4.08	4.16	4.08	3.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	782/1646	4.83	4.59	4.69	4.67	4.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	3.75	1192/1621	3.75	4.14	4.06	4.02	3.75
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	852/1568	4.50	4.39	4.43	4.39	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.64	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	651/1564	4.50	4.28	4.28	4.25	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	695/1559	4.50	4.43	4.29	4.23	4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	4.50	303/1352	4.50	3.97	3.98	3.97	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	201/1384	4.80	4.28	4.08	4.11	4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.60	540/1382	4.60	4.57	4.29	4.37	4.60
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	2	0	2	1	3.40	1206/1368	3.40	4.42	4.30	4.39	3.40
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	104/ 948	4.80	4.10	3.95	4.00	4.80
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.05	***
Frequ	ency	Dist	crib	ution	ı									

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

Course-Section: SPAN 401 0101 University of Maryland Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN Baltimore County FEB 11, 2009

Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 9

Fall 2008 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1585

Job IRBR3029

					Fre	equei	ncies	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 fro	m this course	Λ	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	871/1649	4.33	4.34	4.28	4.50	4.33
1 5	or make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	2	4	3	1.00	1054/1648	4.11	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.11
	stions reflect the e		٥	6	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	401/1375	4.67	4.42	4.27	4.48	4.67
_	tions reflect the ex		٥	0	0	0	1	6	2	4.11	996/1595	4.11	4.29	4.20	4.36	4.11
	dings contribute to		0	0	1	1	2	2	2		1214/1533	3.56	4.16	4.04	4.14	3.56
_	gnments contribute t	-	0	0	0	1	0	4	4	4.22	723/1512	4.22	4.19	4.10	4.26	4.22
	system clearly expla	-	٥	0	0	4	2	2	1		1533/1623	3.00	4.08	4.16	4.27	3.00
5 5	as class cancelled	Inea	٥	0	0	0	0	5	4		1249/1646		4.59	4.69	4.71	4.44
-	ade the overall teac	hing effectiveness	1	0	1	0	2	4	1		1345/1621	3.50	4.14	4.06	4.24	
J. How would you gi	ade the Overail teat	ning effectiveness	_	U		U	2	-	_	3.30	1343/1021	3.30	7.17	1.00	1.21	3.30
	Lecture															
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	4	4.22	1145/1568	4.22	4.39	4.43	4.54	4.22
2. Did the instruct	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	1	8	4.89	640/1572	4.89	4.79	4.70	4.79	4.89
3. Was lecture mate	erial presented and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1229/1564	3.89	4.28	4.28	4.40	3.89
	contribute to what	-	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	4.00	1121/1559	4.00	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.00
	techniques enhance y	•	0	3	0	3	2	0	1	2.83	1266/1352	2.83	3.97	3.98	4.07	2.83
		5														
	Discussion															
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to	what you learned	1	0	0	0	1	3	4	4.38	571/1384	4.38	4.28	4.08	4.35	4.38
	s actively encourage	_	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	521/1382	4.63	4.57	4.29	4.56	4.63
	d open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	560/1368	4.63	4.42	4.30	4.58	4.63	
4. Were special ted	-	1	0	0	0	3	3	2	3.88	546/ 948	3.88	4.10	3.95	4.31	3.88	
	1															
	Fr															
Credits Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	
		_										-			5	

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

Course-Section: SPAN 421 0101 University of Maryland Title Baltimore County STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI Fall 2008

Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1586

FEB 11, 2009

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	0	1	1	10	4.75	328/1649	4.75	4.34	4.28	4.50	4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	2	8	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	2	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	166/1375	4.90	4.42	4.27	4.48	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	9	4.67	321/1595	4.67	4.29	4.20	4.36	4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	106/1533	4.91	4.16	4.04	4.14	4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	151/1512	4.82	4.19	4.10	4.26	4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	4	5	3.92	1164/1623	3.92	4.08	4.16	4.27	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	597/1646	4.92	4.59	4.69	4.71	4.92
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	374/1621	4.50	4.14	4.06	4.24	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	Ο	1	1	9	4.73	535/1568	4.73	4.39	4.43	4.54	4.73
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	532/1572		4.79	4.70	4.79	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	342/1564		4.28	4.28	4.40	4.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	390/1559	4.75	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.75
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	3	3	6	4.25	515/1352		3.97	3.98	4.07	4.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	275/1384		4.28	4.08	4.35	4.73
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	332/1382		4.57	4.29	4.56	4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	0	1	0	10	4.82	358/1368	4.82	4.42	4.30	4.58	4.82
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	133/ 948	4.73	4.10	3.95	4.31	4.73
_														

Frequency Distribution

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	1	Major	6
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	1						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	6
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	11	-	_		
				?	0						

Course-Section: SPAN 472 0101

TOPICS IN LATN AMER CI

Title Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST

Enrollment: 17 Questionnaires: 12

University of Maryland Baltimore County Fall 2008

Page 1587 FEB 11, 2009 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						0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	247/1649	4.83	4.34	4.28	4.50	4.83	
	2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals						0	1	0	3	8	4.50	556/1648	4.50	4.31	4.23	4.36	4.50	
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals						5	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	199/1375	4.86	4.42	4.27	4.48	4.86	
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals						0	0	1	0	3	8	4.50	497/1595	4.50	4.29	4.20	4.36	4.50	
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned						0	0	1	1	1	9	4.50	366/1533	4.50	4.16	4.04	4.14	4.50	
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	142/1512	4.83	4.19	4.10	4.26	4.83	
7. Was the grading system clearly explained						0	0	1	0	3			502/1623	4.50	4.08	4.16	4.27	4.50	
8. How many times was class cancelled						0	0	0	0	7			1277/1646	4.42	4.59		4.71		
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness						0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	152/1621	4.78	4.14	4.06	4.24	4.78	
		Lecture	<u> </u>																
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	535/1568	4.73	4.39	4.43	4.54	4.73	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1572	5.00	4.79	4.70	4.79	5.00	
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	390/1564	4.73	4.28	4.28	4.40	4.73	
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	434/1559	4.73	4.43	4.29	4.41	4.73	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding						0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/1352	5.00	3.97	3.98	4.07	5.00	
Discussion																			
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	326/1384	4.67	4.28	4.08	4.35	4.67	
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate						0	0	0	1	1	10	4.75	394/1382	4.75	4.57	4.29		4.75	
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion					0	0	0	0	0	2		4.83	337/1368	4.83	4.42			4.83	
4. Were special techniques successful					0	2	0	0	1	4	5	4.40	281/ 948	4.40	4.10	3.95	4.31	4.40	
		Laborat	ory																
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified					11	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 555	***	2.56	4.29	4.41	****	
Seminar						0	-	0	•	-	•	0 50	****	ale ale ale ale	0 05	2 60	2 51	ale ale ale ale	
5. Were criteria for grading made clear					10	0	1	0	0	1	0	2.50	****/ 288	****	2.95	3.68	3.71	****	
		Self E	aced																
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students						0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 110	****	4.13	3.99	4.22	****	
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	utior	1										
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						Reasons							Ty	ре		Majors			
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	1	A 5		Red	mir	ed fo	or Ma	ior		1	Graduat	 e	2	Majo	 or	4	
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		Required for Majors					•		-	•) (-		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C 1		General						3	Under-g	rad 1	.0	Non-	major	8	
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D 0													-		
Grad.						Ele	ecti	ctives				2	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	re not enough		
P 0 I 0								uer					respons	es to b	e sign	ifican			
						Oth	ner					4							
? 2																			