```
                                           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   1   5   2   7   5  3.50 1537/1670  4.25  4.36  4.31  4.23  3.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   6   1   5   4   4  2.95 1614/1666  4.09  4.31  4.27  4.30  2.95
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   3   4   1   8   4  3.30 1317/1406  4.23  4.48  4.32  4.31  3.30
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0   3   3   2   7   5  3.40 1496/1615  4.19  4.34  4.24  4.17  3.40
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  1   2   3   5   4   4  3.28 1397/1566  3.94  4.26  4.07  4.03  3.28
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  1   0   8   7   3  3.58 1245/1528  4.16  4.23  4.12  4.00  3.58
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   2   3   7   5   3  3.20 1553/1650  4.04  4.16  4.22  4.28  3.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   0   1  17   2  4.05 1498/1667  4.54  4.47  4.67  4.61  4.05
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0  2   1   6   5   1  3.13 1523/1626  3.82  4.08  4.11  4.07  3.13


             Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   3   3   5   5   4  3.20 1506/1559  4.08  4.38  4.46  4.47  3.20
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   1   1   2   6  10  4.15 1442/1560  4.47  4.75  4.72  4.68  4.15
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   4   2   5   4   5  3.20 1469/1549  4.07  4.34  4.31  4.32  3.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   3   2   8   5  3.55 1366/1546  4.30  4.40  4.32  4.32  3.55
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 4  4   5   3   2   1  2.40 1279/1323  3.61  3.96  4.00  3.91  2.40


             Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0   2   2   3   3   1  2.91 1299/1384  4.16  4.29  4.10  3.92  2.91
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0   2   1   0   4   4  3.64 1147/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29  4.09  3.64
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  1   0   3   3   4  3.82 1082/1378  4.45  4.45  4.31  4.08  3.82
4. Were special techniques successful                  9   2   0   3   0   3   3  3.67  671/ 904  4.24  4.11  4.03  3.94  3.67

             Seminar
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19 0  1   0   0   0   0  1.00 ****/  75  **** 5.00  4.57  4.46  ****

             Field Work
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19  0   0   0   0   0   1  5.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27  4.42  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                 Type                      Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2        0.00-0.99    1        A    3        Required for Majors  6        Graduate      0        Major        0
 28-55     2        1.00-1.99    0        B    6
 56-83     1        2.00-2.99    3        C    5        General              2        Under-grad   20        Non-major   20
 84-150    2        3.00-3.49    2        D    1
 Grad.     0        3.50-4.00    3        F    0        Electives            0        #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                          I    0        Other                5
                                          ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 101  0201          University of Maryland                        Page 1559
Title       ELEMENTARY SPANISH I         Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor: WESTPHAL, GERMA              Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   28
Questionnaires: 22               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  1  6  7  8  4.00 1216/1670  4.25  4.36  4.31  4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  1  1  0 15  5  4.00 1199/1666  4.09  4.31  4.27  4.30  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  5  8  8  4.14  964/1406  4.23  4.48  4.32  4.31  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   2  0  0  4  9  7  4.15  981/1615  4.19  4.34  4.24  4.17  4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   3  1  1  2  7  8  4.05  820/1566  3.94  4.26  4.07  4.03  4.05
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1  0  5  9  7  3.95  969/1528  4.16  4.23  4.12  4.00  3.95
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  2  2  4  6  8  3.73 1376/1650  4.04  4.16  4.22  4.28  3.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  1 16  5  4.18 1416/1667  4.54  4.47  4.67  4.61  4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  1  2  6  7  2  3.39 1445/1626  3.82  4.08  4.11  4.07  3.39


            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  1  3 13  4  3.95 1316/1559  4.08  4.38  4.46  4.47  3.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  3  3  7  8  3.95 1480/1560  4.47  4.75  4.72  4.68  3.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  1  1  5  8  5  3.75 1308/1549  4.07  4.34  4.31  4.32  3.75
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  1  3  8  9  4.19 1032/1546  4.30  4.40  4.32  4.32  4.19
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 15  0  1  1  3  1  3.67  960/1323  3.61  3.96  4.00  3.91  3.67


            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 13  0  0  0  3  3  3  4.00  820/1384  4.16  4.29  4.10  3.92  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  510/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29  4.09  4.63
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0  0  0  2  3  3  4.13  937/1378  4.45  4.45  4.31  4.08  4.13
4. Were special techniques successful                   14  3  1  0  0  1  3  4.00 ****/ 904  4.24  4.11  4.03  3.94  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99    0       A   5          Required for Majors  11     Graduate     0       Major        0
 28-55     3       1.00-1.99    0       B   7
 56-83     5       2.00-2.99    5       C   7          General               2     Under-grad  22       Non-major   22
 84-150    3       3.00-3.49    6       D   1
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    3       F   0          Electives             1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                      responses to be significant
                                        I   0          Other                 5
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 101  0301           University of Maryland                              Page 1560
Title        ELEMENTARY SPANISH I         Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SHORKEY, CATALI              Spring 2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    30
Questionnaires:  17              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   2  0  0  0  1  2 12  4.73   388/1670   4.25 4.36  4.31 4.23  4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    2  0  0  0  0  6  9  4.60   490/1666   4.09 4.31  4.27 4.30  4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   3  0  0  0  1  2 11  4.71   363/1406   4.23 4.48  4.32 4.31  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  1  0  0  1  3 10  4.64   401/1615   4.19 4.34  4.24 4.17  4.64
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2 1  0  1  1  5  7  4.29   610/1566   3.94 4.26  4.07 4.03  4.29
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 1 0 0 1 4 9  4.57   368/1528   4.16 4.23  4.12 4.00  4.57
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3  0  0  1  0  3 10  4.57   471/1650   4.04 4.16  4.22 4.28  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2  1  0  0  0  0 14  5.00     1/1667   4.54 4.47  4.67 4.61  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 2 0 0 1 4 7  4.50   403/1626   3.82 4.08  4.11 4.07  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  1  2  2 10  4.40  1022/1559   4.08 4.38  4.46 4.47  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  1  0 14  4.87   699/1560   4.47 4.75  4.72 4.68  4.87
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  2  3 10  4.53   646/1549   4.07 4.34  4.31 4.32  4.53
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  1  3 11  4.67   520/1546   4.30 4.40  4.32 4.32  4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 2 4 3 6  3.87   849/1323   3.61 3.96  4.00 3.91  3.87


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 10 0 0 0 0 1 6  4.86   195/1384   4.16 4.29  4.10 3.92  4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 10 0 0 0 1 0 6  4.71   441/1378   4.47 4.56  4.29 4.09  4.71
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 10 0 0 0 0 1 6  4.86   333/1378   4.45 4.45  4.31 4.08  4.86
4. Were special techniques successful                  10  0  1  0  0  1  5  4.29   356/ 904   4.24 4.11  4.03 3.94  4.29

                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                 Majors
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1         0.00-0.99   0       A  10        Required for Majors  9    Graduate    0       Major        0
  28-55      1         1.00-1.99   0       B   2
  56-83      4         2.00-2.99   1       C   1        General              2    Under-grad  17      Non-major   17
  84-150     3         3.00-3.49   2       D   0
  Grad.      0         3.50-4.00   3       F   0        Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0                                  responses to be significant
                                          I   0        Other                2
                                          ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 101  0401            University of Maryland                          Page 1561
Title        ELEMENTARY SPANISH I         Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SHORKEY, CATALI              Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires: 16               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  0 14  4.75  363/1670  4.25  4.36  4.31  4.23  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  1 14  4.81  250/1666  4.09  4.31  4.27  4.30  4.81
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75  318/1406  4.23  4.48  4.32  4.31  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  3 11  4.56  488/1615  4.19  4.34  4.24  4.17  4.56
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  1  1  1  4  8  4.13  762/1566  3.94  4.26  4.07  4.03  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0  0  1  2  0 12  4.53  398/1528  4.16  4.23  4.12  4.00  4.53
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  1  0  2 12  4.67  361/1650  4.04  4.16  4.22  4.28  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  1 14  4.93  472/1667  4.54  4.47  4.67  4.61  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 1  0  0  4  6  4.27  704/1626  3.82  4.08  4.11  4.07  4.27


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79  469/1559  4.08  4.38  4.46  4.47  4.79
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1 13  4.93  477/1560  4.47  4.75  4.72  4.68  4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79  323/1549  4.07  4.34  4.31  4.32  4.79
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  1  1 12  4.79  370/1546  4.30  4.40  4.32  4.32  4.79
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  0  2  3  9  4.50  326/1323  3.61  3.96  4.00  3.91  4.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  179/1384  4.16  4.29  4.10  3.92  4.89
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  264/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29  4.09  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1378  4.45  4.45  4.31  4.08  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  0  0  0  0  2  7  4.78  138/ 904  4.24  4.11  4.03  3.94  4.78

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0        0.00-0.99    0      A   7        Required for Majors  8     Graduate    0        Major      0
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B   3
  56-83      3        2.00-2.99    2      C   3        General             0      Under-grad  16       Non-major  16
  84-150     4        3.00-3.49    2      D   0
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    5      F   0        Electives           0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                         I   0        Other               5
                                         ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 102  0101                University of Maryland                              Page 1562
Title         ELEMENTARY SPANISH II            Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   QUIROGA, MARIA                   Spring 2008                                         Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
```
```
Questionnaires: 27                     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   4  0  0  0  5  6 12  4.30  943/1670  4.41 4.36  4.31 4.23  4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    4  0  0  1  3  8 11  4.26  955/1666  4.46 4.31  4.27 4.30  4.26
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   4  0  0  1  2  4 16  4.52  576/1406  4.67 4.48  4.32 4.31  4.52
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    4  0  1  1  4  4 13  4.17  962/1615  4.42 4.34  4.24 4.17  4.17
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  0  1  2  8  4  8  3.70 1185/1566  3.94 4.26  4.07 4.03  3.70
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 4 1 1 2  2  5 12  4.14  814/1528  4.23 4.23  4.12 4.00  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            4  0  0  1  4  8 10  4.17  997/1650  4.32 4.16  4.22 4.28  4.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                  5  1  0  0  0  2 19  4.90  675/1667  4.39 4.47  4.67 4.61  4.90
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 1 0 0  0  7 13  4.65  286/1626  4.39 4.08  4.11 4.07  4.65


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5  0  0  1  0 10 11  4.41 1022/1559  4.52 4.38  4.46 4.47  4.41
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5  0  0  0  0  4 18  4.82  829/1560  4.89 4.75  4.72 4.68  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  4  7 11  4.32  924/1549  4.50 4.34  4.31 4.32  4.32
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5  0  0  1  1  6 14  4.50  715/1546  4.61 4.40  4.32 4.32  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 5 0 0 1  4  3 14  4.36  456/1323  4.16 3.96  4.00 3.91  4.36


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14 0 0 0  3  2  8  4.38  560/1384  4.52 4.29  4.10 3.92  4.38
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14 0 0 0  2  2  9  4.54  579/1378  4.67 4.56  4.29 4.09  4.54
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0 0 1 1  3  8  4.38  768/1378  4.59 4.45  4.31 4.08  4.38
4. Were special techniques successful                  14  1  0  0  4  1  7  4.25  373/ 904  4.41 4.11  4.03 3.94  4.25

              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 26 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  **** 5.00  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 26 0 0 0 0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.63  4.64 4.72  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.88  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                26  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  **** 4.13  3.97 3.99  ****

                        Frequency Distribution
```

```
Credits Earned       Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     2      0.00-0.99   0      A  7      Required for Majors  12    Graduate     0      Major       0
 28-55     2      1.00-1.99   0      B  8                                 Under-grad  27      Non-major  27
 56-83     1      2.00-2.99   5      C  4      General               1
 84-150    6      3.00-3.49   4      D  0                                 #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.     0      3.50-4.00   2      F  0      Electives             3           responses to be significant
                                     P  0
                                     I  0      Other                 4
                                     ?  2
```

| | | | 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	1	2	6	8	4.24	1017/1670	4.41	4.36	4.31	4.23	4.24
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	670/1666	4.46	4.31	4.27	4.30	4.47
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	247/1406	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.31	4.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	592/1615	4.42	4.34	4.24	4.17	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	2	9	5	4.00	851/1566	3.94	4.26	4.07	4.03	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	7	6	4.13	823/1528	4.23	4.23	4.12	4.00	4.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	705/1650	4.32	4.16	4.22	4.28	4.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	1	0	0	0	13	2	4.13	1451/1667	4.39	4.47	4.67	4.61	4.13
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	670/1626	4.39	4.08	4.11	4.07	4.31
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	1072/1559	4.52	4.38	4.46	4.47	4.35
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/1560	4.89	4.75	4.72	4.68	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	802/1549	4.50	4.34	4.31	4.32	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	619/1546	4.61	4.40	4.32	4.32	4.59
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	0	1	3	4	8	4.19	597/1323	4.16	3.96	4.00	3.91	4.19
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	434/1384	4.52	4.29	4.10	3.92	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	316/1378	4.67	4.56	4.29	4.09	4.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1378	4.59	4.45	4.31	4.08	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	11	1	1	0	0	0	4	4.20	405/ 904	4.41	4.11	4.03	3.94	4.20
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 41	****	****	4.50	3.91	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 28	****	****	4.64	4.59	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 16	****	****	4.67	4.83	****

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	B	2						
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	2	C	5	General	1	Under-grad	17	Non-major	16
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	9	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	7				
				?	1						

```
Course-Section: SPAN 102  0301            University of Maryland                                Page 1564
Title        ELEMENTARY SPANISH II        Baltimore County                                     AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  RIBEYRO, CLAUDI              Spring 2008                                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  24
Questionnaires: 18                     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  1 11  6  4.28  974/1670  4.41 4.36  4.31 4.23  4.28
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  5  5  7  4.00 1199/1666  4.46 4.31  4.27 4.30  4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  2 14  4.67  423/1406  4.67 4.48  4.32 4.31  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2   0  0  1  2  4  9  4.31  800/1615  4.42 4.34  4.24 4.17  4.31
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  3  5  8  4.31  579/1566  3.94 4.26  4.07 4.03  4.31
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 0 7 10 4.59 361/1528  4.23 4.23  4.12 4.00  4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   1  0  3  0  5  8  4.13 1055/1650  4.32 4.16  4.22 4.28  4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 16  2  4.11 1465/1667  4.39 4.47  4.67 4.61  4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 2 0 0 2 6 4  4.17  831/1626  4.39 4.08  4.11 4.07  4.17

            Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  1  2  6  9  4.28 1143/1559  4.52 4.38  4.46 4.47  4.28
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  5 12  4.71 1042/1560  4.89 4.75  4.72 4.68  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  0  7  9  4.41  802/1549  4.50 4.34  4.31 4.32  4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  0  1  1  4 10  4.44  808/1546  4.61 4.40  4.32 4.32  4.44
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 0 1 2 6  8  4.24  560/1323  4.16 3.96  4.00 3.91  4.24

            Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  2  2 10  4.57  390/1384  4.52 4.29  4.10 3.92  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  1  1  5  7  4.29  842/1378  4.67 4.56  4.29 4.09  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0 0 0 5 9  4.64  550/1378  4.59 4.45  4.31 4.08  4.64
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   0  0  1  1  5  6  4.23  384/ 904  4.41 4.11  4.03 3.94  4.23

            Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  16  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 232  **** ****  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 4.35  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 218  **** ****  4.18 4.47  ****

            Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 1 1 0 0 0 0  1.00 ****/  87  **** 5.00  4.65 4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 17 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00 ****/  79  **** 4.63  4.64 4.72  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  **** 4.88  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  **** 4.13  3.97 3.99  ****

            Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.28  ****

            Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0 0 1 0 0  3.00 ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      17  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     17  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 102  0301            University of Maryland                          Page 1564
Title          ELEMENTARY SPANISH II        Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    RIBEYRO, CLAUDI                 Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    24
Questionnaires: 18                  Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                        Frequency Distribution


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

Title   ELEMENTARY SPANISH II   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: RIBEYRO, CLAUDI   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 17   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   1   0   2   9   5  4.00 1216/1670  4.41  4.36  4.31  4.23  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   4   5   8  4.24  991/1666  4.46  4.31  4.27  4.30  4.24
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0   0   0   3   1  13  4.59  515/1406  4.67  4.48  4.32  4.31  4.59
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0   1   3   5   7  4.13 1009/1615  4.42  4.34  4.24  4.17  4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   2   2   4   2   2   4  3.14 1447/1566  3.94  4.26  4.07  4.03  3.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  1   2   3   6   5  3.71 1182/1528  4.23  4.23  4.12  4.00  3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   2   3   4   8  4.06 1107/1650  4.32  4.16  4.22  4.28  4.06
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   1  14   2  4.06 1498/1667  4.39  4.47  4.67  4.61  4.06
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0   0   2   6   5  4.23  751/1626  4.39  4.08  4.11  4.07  4.23


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         3   0   0   0   0   5   9  4.64  706/1559  4.52  4.38  4.46  4.47  4.64
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    3   0   0   0   1   3  10  4.64 1114/1560  4.89  4.75  4.72  4.68  4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3   0   0   1   1   6   6  4.21 1010/1549  4.50  4.34  4.31  4.32  4.21
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      3   0   1   0   2   3   8  4.21 1017/1546  4.61  4.40  4.32  4.32  4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3  0   1   0   2   5   6  4.07  666/1323  4.16  3.96  4.00  3.91  4.07


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   2   2   5  4.33  608/1384  4.52  4.29  4.10  3.92  4.33
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0   0   0   0   3   6  4.67  481/1378  4.67  4.56  4.29  4.09  4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0   0   0   1   3   5  4.44  711/1378  4.59  4.45  4.31  4.08  4.44
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   1   0   0   2   1   5  4.38  305/ 904  4.41  4.11  4.03  3.94  4.38
```

                                   Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned         Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      1        0.00-0.99   0        A    4        Required for Majors  10     Graduate     0        Major       0
28-55      0        1.00-1.99   0        B   10
56-83      1        2.00-2.99   1        C    1        General               0     Under-grad  17        Non-major  17
84-150     5        3.00-3.49   0        D    0
Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   5        F    0        Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    2                                   responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                 6
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 102  0601                  University of Maryland                              Page 1566
Title         ELEMENTARY SPANISH II             Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   PETERSON, MARY                    Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   27
Questionnaires: 20                        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  2  1  4 13  4.40  809/1670  4.41  4.36  4.31 4.23  4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  1  0  2  8  9  4.20 1037/1666  4.46  4.31  4.27 4.30  4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  2  1 10  7  4.10  997/1406  4.67  4.48  4.32 4.31  4.10
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  2  0  0  3  5 10  4.39  712/1615  4.42  4.34  4.24 4.17  4.39
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 2  0  2  5  4  6  3.82 1088/1566  3.94  4.26  4.07 4.03  3.82
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 1  2  7  9  4.26  697/1528  4.23  4.23  4.12 4.00  4.26
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  1  3  3  1 11  3.95 1220/1650  4.32  4.16  4.22 4.28  3.95
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  405/1667  4.39  4.47  4.67 4.61  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 0 1  1  9  7  4.22  762/1626  4.39  4.08  4.11 4.07  4.22


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  2  6 10  4.44  971/1559  4.52  4.38  4.46 4.47  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  358/1560  4.89  4.75  4.72 4.68  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0  0  1  1  8  8  4.28  960/1549  4.50  4.34  4.31 4.32  4.28
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     3  0  0  0  3  4 10  4.41  835/1546  4.61  4.40  4.32 4.32  4.41
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 6 0 1  0  3  8  4.50  326/1323  4.16  3.96  4.00 3.91  4.50


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0  0  1  1  4  7  4.31  638/1384  4.52  4.29  4.10 3.92  4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6 0  0  0  0  3 11  4.79  368/1378  4.67  4.56  4.29 4.09  4.79
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0  0  3  2  9  4.43  731/1378  4.59  4.45  4.31 4.08  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                  7  1  0  1  1  1  9  4.50  243/ 904  4.41  4.11  4.03 3.94  4.50


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  18  1  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 18 0 0 0 0 1 1  4.50 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 18 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44 4.58  ****


              Seminar
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0 1 0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  79  ****  4.63  4.64 4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19 0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  75  ****  5.00  4.57 4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.88  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.13  3.97 3.99  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 19 0 0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 4.83  ****
```

Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                  Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      1       0.00-0.99    0        A    4      Required for Majors  8    Graduate    0      Major       0
28-55      1       1.00-1.99    0        B    6                               
56-83      4       2.00-2.99    4        C    6      General           1    Under-grad  20     Non-major   20
84-150     1       3.00-3.49    2        D    1                               
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00    2        F    0      Electives         1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                               responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other             8
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 102  0701            University of Maryland                              Page 1567
Title       ELEMENTARY SPANISH II          Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  COYNE, MARIA                   Spring 2008                                    Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   25
Questionnaires:  17                     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  1  5 11  4.59   578/1670  4.41 4.36  4.31 4.23  4.59
 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  4 12  4.59   516/1666  4.46 4.31  4.27 4.30  4.59
 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  2 14  4.71   375/1406  4.67 4.48  4.32 4.31  4.71
 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1  0  0  1  5 10  4.56   488/1615  4.42 4.34  4.24 4.17  4.56
 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  6  2  8  4.00   851/1566  3.94 4.26  4.07 4.03  4.00
 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2 1 7 7  4.12   832/1528  4.23 4.23  4.12 4.00  4.12
 7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  1  0  1  3 11  4.44   675/1650  4.32 4.16  4.22 4.28  4.44
 8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 11  6  4.35  1295/1667  4.39 4.47  4.67 4.61  4.35
 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 1 0 0 0 6 9  4.60   324/1626  4.39 4.08  4.11 4.07  4.60


                Lecture
 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63   739/1559  4.52 4.38  4.46 4.47  4.63
 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1 15  4.94   417/1560  4.89 4.75  4.72 4.68  4.94
 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  1  0  6  9  4.44   776/1549  4.50 4.34  4.31 4.32  4.44
 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  2 13  4.75   407/1546  4.61 4.40  4.32 4.32  4.75
 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 1 1 2 2 3 7  3.87   849/1323  4.16 3.96  4.00 3.91  3.87


                Discussion
 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64   348/1384  4.52 4.29  4.10 3.92  4.64
 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  1  0  2  8  4.55   571/1378  4.67 4.56  4.29 4.09  4.55
 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0 0 0 0 2 9  4.82   375/1378  4.59 4.45  4.31 4.08  4.82
 4. Were special techniques successful                  6   0  1  0  1  2  7  4.27   361/ 904  4.41 4.11  4.03 3.94  4.27


                Laboratory
 1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 232  **** ****  4.19 4.25  ****
 2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 4.35  ****
 3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.58  ****
 4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 231  **** ****  4.31 4.45  ****
 5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/ 218  **** ****  4.18 4.47  ****


                Seminar
 1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  ****/  87  **** 5.00  4.65 4.67  ****
 2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  ****/  79  **** 4.63  4.64 4.72  ****
 3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  ****/  75  **** 5.00  4.57 4.46  ****
 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  79  **** 4.88  4.45 4.59  ****
 5. Were criteria for grading made clear               16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  80  **** 4.13  3.97 3.99  ****


                Field Work
 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  41  **** ****  4.50 3.91  ****
 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****
 3. Was the instructor available for consultation      16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  38  **** ****  4.62 4.63  ****
 4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  39  **** ****  4.27 4.42  ****
 5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  31  **** ****  4.47 4.28  ****


                Self  Paced
 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 1 0  4.00  ****/  28  **** ****  4.64 4.59  ****
 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****
 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  27  **** ****  4.54 4.46  ****
 4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/  10  **** ****  4.84 4.75  ****
 5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    16   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00  ****/   6  **** ****  4.92 4.83  ****
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	7	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SPAN 102  0801            University of Maryland                        Page 1568
Title       ELEMENTARY SPANISH II          Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor: COYNE, MARIA                      Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 17               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  1  0  4  12  4.59  578/1670  4.41  4.36  4.31  4.23  4.59
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  1  0  3  13  4.65  440/1666  4.46  4.31  4.27  4.30  4.65
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1  16  4.94  115/1406  4.67  4.48  4.32  4.31  4.94
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  1  0  3  13  4.65  401/1615  4.42  4.34  4.24  4.17  4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  0  4  5   6  4.13  762/1566  3.94  4.26  4.07  4.03  4.13
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  3  4  10  4.41  546/1528  4.23  4.23  4.12  4.00  4.41
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  4  13  4.76  263/1650  4.32  4.16  4.22  4.28  4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 14   3  4.18 1423/1667  4.39  4.47  4.67  4.61  4.18
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  2  9   5  4.19  808/1626  4.39  4.08  4.11  4.07  4.19


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  1  7   8  4.44  984/1559  4.52  4.38  4.46  4.47  4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94  417/1560  4.89  4.75  4.72  4.68  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  2  1  13  4.69  463/1549  4.50  4.34  4.31  4.32  4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  1  1  14  4.81  333/1546  4.61  4.40  4.32  4.32  4.81
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  2  0  0  7   6  4.00  692/1323  4.16  3.96  4.00  3.91  4.00


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6   0  0  0  2  1   8  4.55  409/1384  4.52  4.29  4.10  3.92  4.55
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6   0  0  0  0  1  10  4.91  243/1378  4.67  4.56  4.29  4.09  4.91
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  1  0  1  2   7  4.27  856/1378  4.59  4.45  4.31  4.08  4.27
4. Were special techniques successful                   6   1  0  0  1  2   7  4.60  202/ 904  4.41  4.11  4.03  3.94  4.60


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA          Expected Grades          Reasons              Type                   Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      4      0.00-0.99    0       A   10      Required for Majors  10    Graduate    0      Major       0
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0       B    6
 56-83      2      2.00-2.99    2       C    0      General        1          Under-grad  17     Non-major   17
 84-150     3      3.00-3.49    3       D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    3       F    0      Electives      1          #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                               responses to be significant
                                        I    0      Other          4
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 102  0901            University of Maryland                            Page 1569
Title      ELEMENTARY SPANISH II             Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   COYNE, MARIA                      Spring 2008                               Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   22
Questionnaires: 18              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  1  0  0  4  13  4.56   611/1670   4.41  4.36  4.31  4.23  4.56
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  1  0  2  15  4.72   344/1666   4.46  4.31  4.27  4.30  4.72
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  2  15  4.72   352/1406   4.67  4.48  4.32  4.31  4.72
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  2  0  6  10  4.33   775/1615   4.42  4.34  4.24  4.17  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  5  5   8  4.17   734/1566   3.94  4.26  4.07  4.03  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0 2  0  0  6  10  4.22   733/1528   4.23  4.23  4.12  4.00  4.22
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  2  4  11  4.33   806/1650   4.32  4.16  4.22  4.28  4.33
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 10   8  4.44  1216/1667   4.39  4.47  4.67  4.61  4.44
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 1  0  0  5  12  4.50   403/1626   4.39  4.08  4.11  4.07  4.50


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  0  6  11  4.65   706/1559   4.52  4.38  4.46  4.47  4.65
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0  17  5.00     1/1560   4.89  4.75  4.72  4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  3  14  4.82   275/1549   4.50  4.34  4.31  4.32  4.82
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  0  3  14  4.82   322/1546   4.61  4.40  4.32  4.32  4.82
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3 0  1  1  5   6  4.23   560/1323   4.16  3.96  4.00  3.91  4.23


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 4  0  0  0  1  4   9  4.57   390/1384   4.52  4.29  4.10  3.92  4.57
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  0  2  2  10  4.57   548/1378   4.67  4.56  4.29  4.09  4.57
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4 0 0  0  0  4  10  4.71   481/1378   4.59  4.45  4.31  4.08  4.71
4. Were special techniques successful                  4   1  0  1  1  2   9  4.46   261/ 904   4.41  4.11  4.03  3.94  4.46


                                        Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                    Type                     Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0      A    9      Required for Majors  10    Graduate      0      Major        0
 28-55      1      1.00-1.99    0      B    8
 56-83      4      2.00-2.99    5      C    1      General               0    Under-grad   18      Non-major   18
 84-150     5      3.00-3.49    3      D    0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    6      F    0      Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                       I    0      Other                 6
                                       ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 102  1001              University of Maryland                          Page 1570
Title       ELEMENTARY SPANISH II               Baltimore County                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  COYNE, MARIA                        Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   21
Questionnaires: 13                      Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire


                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
               Questions                 NR NA  1  2  3  4  5 Mean    Rank    Mean Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
               General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course  1  0  0  0  0  3  9  4.75   363/1670  4.41 4.36  4.31 4.23  4.75
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   1  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00     1/1666  4.46 4.31  4.27 4.30  5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  1  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00     1/1406  4.67 4.48  4.32 4.31  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   1  1  0  0  1  1  9  4.73   317/1615  4.42 4.34  4.24 4.17  4.73
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  3  4  5  4.17   734/1566  3.94 4.26  4.07 4.03  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  1  4  7  4.50   421/1528  4.23 4.23  4.12 4.00  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  0  0  0  4  8  4.67   361/1650  4.32 4.16  4.22 4.28  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  0  7  5  4.42  1246/1667  4.39 4.47  4.67 4.61  4.42
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64   301/1626  4.39 4.08  4.11 4.07  4.64


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1  0  0  0  0  2 10  4.83   387/1559  4.52 4.38  4.46 4.47  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00     1/1560  4.89 4.75  4.72 4.68  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92   181/1549  4.50 4.34  4.31 4.32  4.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1  0  0  0  0  1 11  4.92   208/1546  4.61 4.40  4.32 4.32  4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  1  0  0  4  3  4  4.00   692/1323  4.16 3.96  4.00 3.91  4.00


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80   221/1384  4.52 4.29  4.10 3.92  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  1  9  4.90   243/1378  4.67 4.56  4.29 4.09  4.90
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60   590/1378  4.59 4.45  4.31 4.08  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                 3  1  0  0  0  2  7  4.78   138/ 904  4.41 4.11  4.03 3.94  4.78


               Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 11  0  0  0  1  1  0  3.50 ****/ 232  **** ****  4.19 4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/ 239  **** ****  4.21 4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11  1  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/ 230  **** ****  4.44 4.58  ****


               Seminar
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   12  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  **** 4.88  4.45 4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               12  0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  80  **** 4.13  3.97 3.99  ****


               Field Work
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  38  **** ****  4.19 4.07  ****


               Self  Paced
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   12  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  16  **** ****  4.67 4.83  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                  Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     1       0.00-0.99   2        A   9      Required for Majors  8      Graduate     0       Major        0
 28-55     2       1.00-1.99   0        B   2
 56-83     2       2.00-2.99   1        C   0      General              0      Under-grad  13       Non-major   13
 84-150    2       3.00-3.49   0        D   0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00   5        F   0      Electives            2      #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                2
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 103  0101              University of Maryland                            Page 1571
Title       INT REV ELEM SPANISH            Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   NASH, LYLE                    Spring 2008                                       Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires: 19                   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  1  6 12  4.58  589/1670  4.01  4.36  4.31  4.23  4.58
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  0  0  4  7  7  4.17 1070/1666  3.77  4.31  4.27  4.30  4.17
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  0  0  1  7 10  4.50  597/1406  3.84  4.48  4.32  4.31  4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  9  9  4.50  552/1615  4.00  4.34  4.24  4.17  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  5  0  1  0  5  7  4.38  510/1566  3.83  4.26  4.07  4.03  4.38
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 1  0  0  8  8  4.29  670/1528  3.76  4.23  4.12  4.00  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  1  2  2  8  5  3.78 1347/1650  3.72  4.16  4.22  4.28  3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 14  4  4.22 1388/1667  4.08  4.47  4.67  4.61  4.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0  0  2  8  3  4.08  915/1626  3.79  4.08  4.11  4.07  4.08


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        5   0  0  0  2  6  6  4.29 1136/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46  4.47  4.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   5   0  0  0  0  4 10  4.71 1023/1560  4.59  4.75  4.72  4.68  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 5  0  0  0  1  8  5  4.29  952/1549  3.91  4.34  4.31  4.32  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0  0  0  2  5  7  4.36  899/1546  3.89  4.40  4.32  4.32  4.36
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 4 1  0  2  2  4  3.89  834/1323  3.14  3.96  4.00  3.91  3.89


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  487/1384  3.81  4.29  4.10  3.92  4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  1  3  7  4.55  571/1378  4.19  4.56  4.29  4.09  4.55
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 0  0  2  3  6  4.36  786/1378  4.02  4.45  4.31  4.08  4.36
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   1  0  0  4  3  3  3.90  570/ 904  3.45  4.11  4.03  3.94  3.90


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19  4.25  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 17 0 0 0 0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  4.35  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 17 0 0 0 0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44  4.58  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31  4.45  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 17  0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18  4.47  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 17 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65  4.67  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 18 0 0 0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.63  4.64  4.72  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 17 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  75  ****  5.00  4.57  4.46  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.88  4.45  4.59  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.13  3.97  3.99  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 17 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 17 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19  4.07  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62  4.63  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27  4.42  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 17 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47  4.28  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 17 0 0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  4.59  ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67  4.83  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  4.46  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  4.75  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    17   0  0  0  0  0  2  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  4.83  ****
```

Title   INT REV ELEM SPANISH   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: NASH, LYLE   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 21
Questionnaires: 19   Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	B	4						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	4	General	2	Under-grad	19	Non-major	19
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	2				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SPAN 103  0201                 University of Maryland                              Page 1572
Title      INT REV ELEM SPANISH                   Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SIMORANGKIR, MO                        Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   20
Questionnaires: 17                        Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

                                          Frequencies      Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                NR  NA  1  2  3  4  5  Mean     Rank      Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean  Mean
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1   0  2  1  4  6  3  3.44 1557/1670  4.01  4.36  4.31  4.23  3.44
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  1  2  7  2  4  3.38 1552/1666  3.77  4.31  4.27  4.30  3.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1   0  2  1  7  4  2  3.19 1334/1406  3.84  4.48  4.32  4.31  3.19
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  2  1  5  3  5  3.50 1448/1615  4.00  4.34  4.24  4.17  3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 2  4  1  1  5  2  2  3.27 1397/1566  3.83  4.26  4.07  4.03  3.27
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 2 1  1  6  4  1  3.23 1404/1528  3.76  4.23  4.12  4.00  3.23
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            2   0  0  1  6  5  3  3.67 1404/1650  3.72  4.16  4.22  4.28  3.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                  2   0  0  0  1 14  0  3.93 1583/1667  4.08  4.47  4.67  4.61  3.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 0 0 1  5  5  1  3.50 1384/1626  3.79  4.08  4.11  4.07  3.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        4   0  0  1  3  6  3  3.85 1378/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46  4.47  3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   4   0  0  1  1  2  9  4.46 1279/1560  4.59  4.75  4.72  4.68  4.46
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4  0  1  1  4  4  3  3.54 1381/1549  3.91  4.34  4.31  4.32  3.54
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     5   0  1  2  2  5  2  3.42 1407/1546  3.89  4.40  4.32  4.32  3.42
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4 3 3 3  2  1  1  2.40 1279/1323  3.14  3.96  4.00  3.91  2.40


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0  0  1  3  2  0  3.17 1231/1384  3.81  4.29  4.10  3.92  3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0  0  1  2  0  3  3.83 1081/1378  4.19  4.56  4.29  4.09  3.83
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0 0 1  2  1  2  3.67 1147/1378  4.02  4.45  4.31  4.08  3.67
4. Were special techniques successful                  11   0  1  1  2  1  1  3.00  820/ 904  3.45  4.11  4.03  3.94  3.00

              Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50  3.91  ****


                                          Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                Type                 Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     0         0.00-0.99   0        A   3        Required for Majors  8      Graduate     0        Major      0
  28-55     1         1.00-1.99   0        B   8
  56-83     2         2.00-2.99   3        C   1        General              1      Under-grad  17        Non-major 17
  84-150    3         3.00-3.49   1        D   1
  Grad.     0         3.50-4.00   2        F   0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                           P   0                                   responses to be significant
                                           I   0        Other                3
                                           ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 201  0201          University of Maryland                      Page 1573
Title       INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I       Baltimore County                      AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  RICHARDS, F                 Spring 2008                           Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  22
Questionnaires: 14            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  2  4  7  1  0  2.50 1654/1670  4.08 4.36 4.31 4.32  2.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  4  5  4  1  0  2.14 1655/1666  4.17 4.31 4.27 4.27  2.14
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  2  3  4  4  1  2.93 1367/1406  4.31 4.48 4.32 4.39  2.93
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1   0  2  2  5  3  1  2.92 1582/1615  4.23 4.34 4.24 4.29  2.92
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  2  4  4  3  0  2.62 1535/1566  3.73 4.26 4.07 4.00  2.62
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 1 2 7  4  0  3.00 1447/1528  3.96 4.23 4.12 4.11  3.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  3  7  2  2  0  2.21 1634/1650  4.11 4.16 4.22 4.20  2.21
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0 12  2  4.14 1444/1667  4.55 4.47 4.67 4.64  4.14
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 5 4 3  0  0  1.83 1619/1626  3.97 4.08 4.11 4.06  1.83

              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2   0  4  5  2  1  0  2.00 1549/1559  4.07 4.38 4.46 4.40  2.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2   0  0  4  6  1  1  2.92 1552/1560  4.52 4.75 4.72 4.73  2.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  6  1  5  0  0  1.92 1542/1549  4.15 4.34 4.31 4.25  1.92
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  5  4  2  1  0  1.92 1537/1546  4.22 4.40 4.32 4.30  1.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 4 4 1 3  0  0  1.88 1307/1323  3.54 3.96 4.00 4.08  1.88

              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  1  3  2  0  3.17 1231/1384  4.22 4.29 4.10 4.07  3.17
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  1  1  2  1  1  3.00 1297/1378  4.47 4.56 4.29 4.25  3.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0 3 2 0  1  0  1.83 1373/1378  4.26 4.45 4.31 4.26  1.83
4. Were special techniques successful                  8   0  1  0  2  3  0  3.17  808/ 904  4.11 4.11 4.03 4.01  3.17
```

```
                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                Type                   Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1     0.00-0.99    0      A   0      Required for Majors  8    Graduate    0      Major       1
  28-55      1     1.00-1.99    0      B   6                                Under-grad  14     Non-major   13
  56-83      0     2.00-2.99    2      C   6      General              1    Under-grad  14     Non-major   13
  84-150     1     3.00-3.49    1      D   0
  Grad.      0     3.50-4.00    2      F   0      Electives            0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                       P   0                               responses to be significant
                                       I   0      Other                2
                                       ?   0
```

```
                                                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   1   1   5   3   5  3.67 1486/1670  4.08  4.36  4.31 4.32  3.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   5   4   6  4.07 1161/1666  4.17  4.31  4.27 4.27  4.07
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0   0   0   3   4   7  4.29  852/1406  4.31  4.48  4.32 4.39  4.29
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     1   0   0   2   2   4   6  4.00 1083/1615  4.23  4.34  4.24 4.29  4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1   0   0   1   7   2   4  3.64 1210/1566  3.73  4.26  4.07 4.00  3.64
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0   0   1   4   5   4  3.86 1080/1528  3.96  4.23  4.12 4.11  3.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0   0   1   4   3   6  4.00 1135/1650  4.11  4.16  4.22 4.20  4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0   0   1   0   8   5  4.21 1395/1667  4.55  4.47  4.67 4.64  4.21
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0   0   1   3   6   2  3.75 1254/1626  3.97  4.08  4.11 4.06  3.75


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0   0   1   4   4   4  3.85 1378/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46 4.40  3.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0   0   0   0   6   7  4.54 1222/1560  4.52  4.75  4.72 4.73  4.54
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0   1   1   3   5   3  3.62 1361/1549  4.15  4.34  4.31 4.25  3.62
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0   0   0   4   5   4  4.00 1139/1546  4.22  4.40  4.32 4.30  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2   2   0   6   0   3  3.18 1149/1323  3.54  3.96  4.00 4.08  3.18


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8   0   0   0   3   1   3  4.00  820/1384  4.22  4.29  4.10 4.07  4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8   0   0   0   1   3   3  4.29  842/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29 4.25  4.29
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8  0   0   0   2   3   2  4.00  977/1378  4.26  4.45  4.31 4.26  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                   8   1   0   0   2   2   2  4.00  461/ 904  4.11  4.11  4.03 4.01  4.00
```

                                            Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades          Reasons                   Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      1        0.00-0.99   0        A    6        Required for Majors  10     Graduate      0      Major         0
 28-55      4        1.00-1.99   0        B    3                                    Under-grad   15      Non-major    15
 56-83      0        2.00-2.99   0        C    3        General               0
 84-150     2        3.00-3.49   7        D    0                                    #### - Means there are not enough
 Grad.      0        3.50-4.00   3        F    0        Electives             0            responses to be significant
                                          P    0
                                          I    0        Other                 2
                                          ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 201  0501            University of Maryland                                    Page 1575
Title       INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I        Baltimore County                                        AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  COLOMBO, LAURA               Spring 2008                                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires:  20                   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  1  5 14  4.65  492/1670  4.08  4.36  4.31 4.32  4.65
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  2  2 16  4.70  378/1666  4.17  4.31  4.27 4.27  4.70
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  7 13  4.65  435/1406  4.31  4.48  4.32 4.39  4.65
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  1  9 10  4.45  633/1615  4.23  4.34  4.24 4.29  4.45
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  1  2  4  6  6  3.74 1159/1566  3.73  4.26  4.07 4.00  3.74
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  3  8  8  4.15  796/1528  3.96  4.23  4.12 4.11  4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  7 12  4.55  499/1650  4.11  4.16  4.22 4.20  4.55
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  1 19  4.95  405/1667  4.55  4.47  4.67 4.64  4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0 0  0  3  3 11  4.47  451/1626  3.97  4.08  4.11 4.06  4.47


          Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  1  3 14  4.72  572/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46 4.40  4.72
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1 17  4.94  358/1560  4.52  4.75  4.72 4.73  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  5 13  4.72  410/1549  4.15  4.34  4.31 4.25  4.72
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  0  3 15  4.83  310/1546  4.22  4.40  4.32 4.30  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  0  0  4  2 12  4.44  384/1323  3.54  3.96  4.00 4.08  4.44


          Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9  0  0  1  0  3  7  4.45  487/1384  4.22  4.29  4.10 4.07  4.45
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9  0  0  0  1  4  6  4.45  660/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29 4.25  4.45
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9 0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  560/1378  4.26  4.45  4.31 4.26  4.64
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  0  0  1  2  4  4  4.00  461/ 904  4.11  4.11  4.03 4.01  4.00


          Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 18  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19 4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 19 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21 4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 19 0 0 0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44 4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31 4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18 4.25  ****


          Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 18  1  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 19 0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  4.63  4.64 4.75  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  75  ****  5.00  4.57 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned    19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  79  ****  4.88  4.45 3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  80  ****  4.13  3.97 4.30  ****


          Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 19  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 2.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 2.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation       19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations   19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 19  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47 4.00  ****


          Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 18  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 **** ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal    18  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 **** ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      18  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 **** ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       18  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84 **** ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     18  0  0  0  0  1  1  4.50 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92 **** ****
```

                                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned   Cum. GPA   Expected Grades   Reasons   Type   Majors
----
 00-27   1   0.00-0.99   0   A   3   Required for Majors 15   Graduate   0   Major   0
 28-55   3   1.00-1.99   0   B   15
 56-83   1   2.00-2.99   5   C   1   General   1   Under-grad 20   Non-major   20
 84-150   7   3.00-3.49   7   D   0
 Grad.   0   3.50-4.00   1   F   0   Electives   0   #### - Means there are not enough
                                          P   0   responses to be significant
                                          I   0   Other   3
                                          ?   0

```
Course-Section: SPAN 201  0601            University of Maryland                          Page 1576
Title        INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I        Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  COLOMBO, LAURA                  Spring 2008                             Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     21
Questionnaires: 15              Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire
```

```
                                                Frequencies        Instructor   Course Dept  UMBC Level  Sect
              Questions                   NR  NA  1  2  3  4   5  Mean    Rank    Mean  Mean  Mean Mean  Mean
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
              General
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course   1  0  0  0  1  4   9  4.57  589/1670  4.08  4.36  4.31  4.32  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1  0  0  0  0  2  12  4.86  216/1666  4.17  4.31  4.27  4.27  4.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   1  0  0  0  1  2  11  4.71  363/1406  4.31  4.48  4.32  4.39  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    1  0  0  0  1  4   9  4.57  477/1615  4.23  4.34  4.24  4.29  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  3  2  0  1  2   6  3.91 1010/1566  3.73  4.26  4.07  4.00  3.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  0  4  4   6  4.14  805/1528  3.96  4.23  4.12  4.11  4.14
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1  0  0  0  0  1  13  4.93  127/1650  4.11  4.16  4.22  4.20  4.93
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1  0  0  0  0  1  13  4.93  540/1667  4.55  4.47  4.67  4.64  4.93
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2  0  0  0  0  7   6  4.46  467/1626  3.97  4.08  4.11  4.06  4.46


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        2  0  0  0  0  2  11  4.85  371/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46  4.40  4.85
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   2  0  0  0  0  1  12  4.92  477/1560  4.52  4.75  4.72  4.73  4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  0  3  10  4.77  352/1549  4.15  4.34  4.31  4.25  4.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2  0  0  0  0  2  11  4.85  299/1546  4.22  4.40  4.32  4.30  4.85
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  0  0  0  4  2   7  4.23  560/1323  3.54  3.96  4.00  4.08  4.23


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 6  0  0  0  1  1   7  4.67  324/1384  4.22  4.29  4.10  4.07  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 6  0  0  0  0  1   8  4.89  264/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29  4.25  4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6  0  0  0  0  2   7  4.78  417/1378  4.26  4.45  4.31  4.26  4.78
4. Were special techniques successful                  6  1  1  0  0  1   6  4.38  305/ 904  4.11  4.11  4.03  4.01  4.38
```

```
                                Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned         Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                    Type                    Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27     4       0.00-0.99    1       A    5       Required for Majors  11    Graduate     0       Major        0
  28-55     0       1.00-1.99    0       B    4
  56-83     0       2.00-2.99    3       C    3       General               1    Under-grad  15       Non-major   15
  84-150    2       3.00-3.49    2       D    1
  Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    2       F    0       Electives             0    #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                         I    0       Other                 2
                                         ?    0
```

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 15   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  1  0  2  2 10  4.33  902/1670  4.08  4.36  4.31  4.32  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    1   0  1  0  1  5  7  4.21 1015/1666  4.17  4.31  4.27  4.27  4.21
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  0  3 11  4.60  495/1406  4.31  4.48  4.32  4.39  4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  3  2 10  4.47  606/1615  4.23  4.34  4.24  4.29  4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  2  1  1  2  6  3  3.69 1185/1566  3.73  4.26  4.07  4.00  3.69
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 0 0 0 2 3 9  4.50  421/1528  3.96  4.23  4.12  4.11  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  1  3  3  8  4.20  973/1650  4.11  4.16  4.22  4.20  4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  9  6  4.40 1256/1667  4.55  4.47  4.67  4.64  4.40
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 1 1 0 0 2 7  4.40  563/1626  3.97  4.08  4.11  4.06  4.40


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  4  3  8  4.27 1150/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46  4.40  4.27
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  0 14  5.00    1/1560  4.52  4.75  4.72  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  3  3  8  4.20 1027/1549  4.15  4.34  4.31  4.25  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  2  0  1  1 10  4.21 1017/1546  4.22  4.40  4.32  4.30  4.21
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 3  2  0  3  3  2  3.30 1107/1323  3.54  3.96  4.00  4.08  3.30


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 5  0  0  0  1  3  6  4.50  434/1384  4.22  4.29  4.10  4.07  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 5  0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29  4.25  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 6 0  0  0  0  0  9  5.00    1/1378  4.26  4.45  4.31  4.26  5.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  6   2  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  356/ 904  4.11  4.11  4.03  4.01  4.29
```

                                  Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons              Type               Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27    1        0.00-0.99   1       A    3       Required for Majors  10    Graduate     0      Major       0
  28-55    0        1.00-1.99   0       B    6
  56-83    0        2.00-2.99   0       C    3       General               0    Under-grad  15      Non-major  15
  84-150   5        3.00-3.49   4       D    0
  Grad.    0        3.50-4.00   2       F    0       Electives             1    #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P    0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I    0       Other                 1
                                        ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 201  0801            University of Maryland                        Page 1578
Title        INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I          Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  STRICKLING, LAU                  Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     28
Questionnaires:  18              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  1  4  13  4.67  479/1670  4.08  4.36  4.31  4.32  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     1   0  0  0  0  1  16  4.94  104/1666  4.17  4.31  4.27  4.27  4.94
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  16  4.89  205/1406  4.31  4.48  4.32  4.39  4.89
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  16  4.89  189/1615  4.23  4.34  4.24  4.29  4.89
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   2  0  3  1  5   7  4.00  851/1566  3.73  4.26  4.07  4.00  4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  0  0  1  5  11  4.59  361/1528  3.96  4.23  4.12  4.11  4.59
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  1  17  4.94   95/1650  4.11  4.16  4.22  4.20  4.94
8. How many times was class cancelled                   1   0  0  0  0  0  17  5.00    1/1667  4.55  4.47  4.67  4.64  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0  0  0  0  3  11  4.79  183/1626  3.97  4.08  4.11  4.06  4.79


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  0  0  0  1  16  4.94  166/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46  4.40  4.94
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  0  1  16  4.94  358/1560  4.52  4.75  4.72  4.73  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  0  1  16  4.94  121/1549  4.15  4.34  4.31  4.25  4.94
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  0  0  0  17  5.00    1/1546  4.22  4.40  4.32  4.30  5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  2  0  0  4  1   9  4.36  465/1323  3.54  3.96  4.00  4.08  4.36


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 14  0  0  0  0  0   4  5.00  ****/1384  4.22  4.29  4.10  4.07  ****
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 14  0  0  0  0  0   4  5.00  ****/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29  4.25  ****
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 14 0  0  0  0  0   4  5.00  ****/1378  4.26  4.45  4.31  4.26  ****
4. Were special techniques successful                   14  0  0  0  0  0   4  5.00  ****/ 904  4.11  4.11  4.03  4.01  ****

                             Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons              Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27     0       0.00-0.99    0        A    7      Required for Majors  13   Graduate    0      Major        0
 28-55     3       1.00-1.99    0        B    8
 56-83     1       2.00-2.99    2        C    1      General               1   Under-grad  18     Non-major   18
 84-150    5       3.00-3.49    3        D    0
 Grad.     0       3.50-4.00    2        F    0      Electives             1   #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                               responses to be significant
                                         I    0      Other                 2
                                         ?    1
```

Title   INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 19   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  6  11  4.47  708/1670  4.08  4.36  4.31  4.32  4.47
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  3  5  11  4.42  751/1666  4.17  4.31  4.27  4.27  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  1  2  3  13  4.47  632/1406  4.31  4.48  4.32  4.39  4.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  2  5  12  4.53  530/1615  4.23  4.34  4.24  4.29  4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  1  3  6   8  4.17  734/1566  3.73  4.26  4.07  4.00  4.17
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 2  2  7   8  4.11  842/1528  3.96  4.23  4.12  4.11  4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  0  3  7   9  4.32  831/1650  4.11  4.16  4.22  4.20  4.32
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0 10   9  4.47 1186/1667  4.55  4.47  4.67  4.64  4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 6 0 0 0  0  5   8  4.62  316/1626  3.97  4.08  4.11  4.06  4.62


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       3   0  0  0  4  5   7  4.19 1205/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46  4.40  4.19
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  3   0  0  0  0  1  15  4.94  417/1560  4.52  4.75  4.72  4.73  4.94
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 3  0  0  0  1  6   9  4.50  683/1549  4.15  4.34  4.31  4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3   0  0  1  0  4  11  4.56  643/1546  4.22  4.40  4.32  4.30  4.56
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 3 4 0 0  4  3   5  4.08  663/1323  3.54  3.96  4.00  4.08  4.08


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 12 0 1 0  0  2   4  4.14  758/1384  4.22  4.29  4.10  4.07  4.14
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 12 0 0 1  0  1   5  4.43  695/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29  4.25  4.43
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 12 0 0 0 0  4   3  4.43  731/1378  4.26  4.45  4.31  4.26  4.43
4. Were special techniques successful                 12   1  0  0  0  2   4  4.67  179/ 904  4.11  4.11  4.03  4.01  4.67
```

                                  Frequency Distribution

```
Credits Earned          Cum. GPA        Expected Grades        Reasons                 Type                  Majors
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
00-27      0       0.00-0.99   0        A   7       Required for Majors  14    Graduate    0      Major       0
28-55      2       1.00-1.99   0        B   5
56-83      2       2.00-2.99   4        C   5       General              0     Under-grad  19     Non-major  19
84-150     6       3.00-3.49   3        D   0
Grad.      0       3.50-4.00   3        F   0       Electives            1     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0       Other                2
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 201  1001           University of Maryland                              Page 1580
Title       INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I       Baltimore County                                   AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   RIBEYRO, CLAUDI            Spring 2008                                        Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    25
Questionnaires: 17                    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  2  0  0  4 11  4.29  953/1670  4.08  4.36  4.31 4.32  4.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0  0  1  0  2  3 11  4.35  846/1666  4.17  4.31  4.27 4.27  4.35
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0  0  1  1  1  1 13  4.41  703/1406  4.31  4.48  4.32 4.39  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0  0  1  1  3  2 10  4.12 1018/1615  4.23  4.34  4.24 4.29  4.12
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 2  3  0  1  2  9  3.93  962/1566  3.73  4.26  4.07 4.00  3.93
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 2 1 2 3 9  3.94  983/1528  3.96  4.23  4.12 4.11  3.94
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           1  0  1  0  4  1 10  4.19  985/1650  4.11  4.16  4.22 4.20  4.19
8. How many times was class cancelled                 1  0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63 1062/1667  4.55  4.47  4.67 4.64  4.63
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0 1 2 0 7 5  3.87 1162/1626  3.97  4.08  4.11 4.06  3.87


           Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       2  0  2  0  1  4  8  4.07 1265/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46 4.40  4.07
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  2  0  0  0  2  2 11  4.60 1163/1560  4.52  4.75  4.72 4.73  4.60
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 2 1 0 1 11  4.20 1027/1549  4.15  4.34  4.31 4.25  4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    3  0  3  0  0  2  9  4.00 1139/1546  4.22  4.40  4.32 4.30  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0 2 0 3 5 6  3.81  886/1323  3.54  3.96  4.00 4.08  3.81


           Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 1 0 2 0 7  4.20  712/1384  4.22  4.29  4.10 4.07  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 1 0 9  4.80  348/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29 4.25  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 1 0 9  4.80  386/1378  4.26  4.45  4.31 4.26  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                 7  2  0  1  1  0  6  4.38  305/ 904  4.11  4.11  4.03 4.01  4.38


           Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19 4.35  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21 4.33  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44 4.61  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance          16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31 4.52  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18 4.25  ****


           Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  87  ****  5.00  4.65 5.00  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.63  4.64 4.75  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  75  ****  5.00  4.57 4.25  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned   16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  79  ****  4.88  4.45 3.95  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear               16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  80  ****  4.13  3.97 4.30  ****


           Field Work
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  41  ****  ****  4.50 2.00  ****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.19 2.50  ****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation      16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  38  ****  ****  4.62 4.50  ****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations  16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  39  ****  ****  4.27 4.00  ****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  31  ****  ****  4.47 4.00  ****


           Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64 **** ****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal   16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  16  ****  ****  4.67 **** ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful     16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54 **** ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful      16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84 **** ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students    16 0 0 0 0 0 1  5.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92 **** ****
```

Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA		Expected Grades		Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	12	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B	7						
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	2	C	1	General	0	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means there are not enough			
				P	0			responses to be significant			
				I	0	Other	3				
				?	0						

```
Course-Section: SPAN 201  1101            University of Maryland                              Page 1581
Title        INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I         Baltimore County                               AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  RIBEYRO, CLAUDI                  Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 13                  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   2  0  2  1  3  2  3  3.27 1594/1670  4.08 4.36  4.31 4.32  3.27
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    3  0  0  1  4  3  2  3.60 1479/1666  4.17 4.31  4.27 4.27  3.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   2  0  0  1  5  3  2  3.55 1265/1406  4.31 4.48  4.32 4.39  3.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    2  0  1  0  3  3  4  3.82 1288/1615  4.23 4.34  4.24 4.29  3.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 4  3  0  1  1  2  2  3.83 1078/1566  3.73 4.26  4.07 4.00  3.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 3 1  1  0  5  0  3  3.44 1306/1528  3.96 4.23  4.12 4.11  3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            3  0  1  0  4  1  4  3.70 1388/1650  4.11 4.16  4.22 4.20  3.70
8. How many times was class cancelled                  3  0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  992/1667  4.55 4.47  4.67 4.64  4.70
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 5 1  0  0  4  3  0  3.43 1427/1626  3.97 4.08  4.11 4.06  3.43


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        6  0  1  1  1  2  2  3.43 1477/1559  4.07 4.38  4.46 4.40  3.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   6  0  1  1  1  2  2  3.43 1532/1560  4.52 4.75  4.72 4.73  3.43
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 6  0  0  1  0  4  2  4.00 1146/1549  4.15 4.34  4.31 4.25  4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     6  0  0  0  3  1  3  4.00 1139/1546  4.22 4.40  4.32 4.30  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 6 3  2  0  0  1  1  2.75 1248/1323  3.54 3.96  4.00 4.08  2.75


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 8  0  0  1  0  1  3  4.20  712/1384  4.22 4.29  4.10 4.07  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 8  0  0  0  1  1  3  4.40  718/1378  4.47 4.56  4.29 4.25  4.40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 0  1  0  0  0  4  4.20  899/1378  4.26 4.45  4.31 4.26  4.20
4. Were special techniques successful                  9  1  0  0  0  1  2  4.67 ****/ 904  4.11 4.11  4.03 4.01  ****

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 201  1201              University of Maryland                          Page 1582
Title           INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I        Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:     SIMORANGKIR, MO                 Spring 2008                                Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     19
Questionnaires: 12                   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  0  7  5  4.42  794/1670  4.08  4.36  4.31  4.32  4.42
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  5  6  4.42  767/1666  4.17  4.31  4.27  4.27  4.42
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  0  0  0  4  7  4.64  459/1406  4.31  4.48  4.32  4.39  4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  6  6  4.50  552/1615  4.23  4.34  4.24  4.29  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   4  0  1  3  1  3  3.75 1144/1566  3.73  4.26  4.07  4.00  3.75
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 1  1  1  0  5  4  3.91 1039/1528  3.96  4.23  4.12  4.11  3.91
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  2  0  5  5  4.08 1090/1650  4.11  4.16  4.22  4.20  4.08
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0 11  1  4.08 1482/1667  4.55  4.47  4.67  4.64  4.08
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  8  2  4.09  905/1626  3.97  4.08  4.11  4.06  4.09


               Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         2   0  0  0  2  2  6  4.40 1022/1559  4.07  4.38  4.46  4.40  4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    2   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1560  4.52  4.75  4.72  4.73  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  562/1549  4.15  4.34  4.31  4.25  4.60
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      2   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  345/1546  4.22  4.40  4.32  4.30  4.80
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 4  3  0  1  2  1  1  3.40 1082/1323  3.54  3.96  4.00  4.08  3.40


               Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 9   0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  324/1384  4.22  4.29  4.10  4.07  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 9   0  0  0  0  0  3  5.00    1/1378  4.47  4.56  4.29  4.25  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 9  0  0  0  0  1  2  4.67  531/1378  4.26  4.45  4.31  4.26  4.67
4. Were special techniques successful                   9   0  0  1  0  0  2  4.00  461/ 904  4.11  4.11  4.03  4.01  4.00

                                  Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 202  0101             University of Maryland                          Page 1583
Title       INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I          Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  VAL, ADRIANA                   Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   12
Questionnaires:  9              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  1  0  1  2  5  4.11 1150/1670  4.25 4.36  4.31 4.32  4.11
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  3  2  4  4.11 1125/1666  4.25 4.31  4.27 4.27  4.11
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   5  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  318/1406  4.72 4.48  4.32 4.39  4.75
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  3  5  4.44  633/1615  4.30 4.34  4.24 4.29  4.44
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  2  2  2  3  3.67 1200/1566  4.00 4.26  4.07 4.00  3.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  3  6  4.67  300/1528  4.50 4.23  4.12 4.11  4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  1  3  2  3  3.78 1347/1650  3.85 4.16  4.22 4.20  3.78
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  8  1  4.11 1465/1667  4.56 4.47  4.67 4.64  4.11
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0  0  0  3  5  1  3.78 1240/1626  3.76 4.08  4.11 4.06  3.78

                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  4  5  4.56  834/1559  4.35 4.38  4.46 4.40  4.56
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  1  7  4.67 1090/1560  4.83 4.75  4.72 4.73  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  0  0  2  5  1  3.88 1251/1549  3.94 4.34  4.31 4.25  3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  4  4  4.33  919/1546  4.21 4.40  4.32 4.30  4.33
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  1  2  1  5  4.11  648/1323  4.06 3.96  4.00 4.08  4.11

                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43  519/1384  4.46 4.29  4.10 4.07  4.43
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  295/1378  4.68 4.56  4.29 4.25  4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  608/1378  4.79 4.45  4.31 4.26  4.57
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   1  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  179/ 904  4.83 4.11  4.03 4.01  4.67
```

```
                              Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 13   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

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did you gain new insights,skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	835/1670	4.25	4.36	4.31	4.32	4.38
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	7	4.38	808/1666	4.25	4.31	4.27	4.27	4.38
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	387/1406	4.72	4.48	4.32	4.39	4.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	3	6	4.15	981/1615	4.30	4.34	4.24	4.29	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	4	6	4.33	559/1566	4.00	4.26	4.07	4.00	4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	3	2	7	4.33	631/1528	4.50	4.23	4.12	4.11	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	2	3	2	6	3.92	1249/1650	3.85	4.16	4.22	4.20	3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1667	4.56	4.47	4.67	4.64	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	5	0	0	0	3	4	1	3.75	1254/1626	3.76	4.08	4.11	4.06	3.75

Lecture

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	4.15	1224/1559	4.35	4.38	4.46	4.40	4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1560	4.83	4.75	4.72	4.73	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	4.00	1146/1549	3.94	4.34	4.31	4.25	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	4.08	1113/1546	4.21	4.40	4.32	4.30	4.08
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	1	0	1	4	4	4.00	692/1323	4.06	3.96	4.00	4.08	4.00

Discussion

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	434/1384	4.46	4.29	4.10	4.07	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	9	0	0	0	1	0	3	4.50	603/1378	4.68	4.56	4.29	4.25	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/1378	4.79	4.45	4.31	4.26	5.00
4. Were special techniques successful	9	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 904	4.83	4.11	4.03	4.01	5.00

Laboratory

Question	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	12	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	****	4.19	4.35	****

Frequency Distribution

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

Enrollment: 1
Questionnaires: 1   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  0  0  1 5.00    1/1670  5.00  4.36  4.31 4.32   5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1666  5.00  4.31  4.27 4.27   5.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1406  5.00  4.48  4.32 4.39   5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 1083/1615  4.00  4.34  4.24 4.29   4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00  851/1566  4.00  4.26  4.07 4.00   4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1528  5.00  4.23  4.12 4.11   5.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0  0  0  0  1  0  0 3.00 1580/1650  3.00  4.16  4.22 4.20   3.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.47  4.67 4.64   5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0  0  0  1  0  0  0 2.00 1612/1626  2.00  4.08  4.11 4.06   2.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00 1280/1559  4.00  4.38  4.46 4.40   4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.75  4.72 4.73   5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1549  5.00  4.34  4.31 4.25   5.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0  0  0  0  0  0  1 5.00    1/1546  5.00  4.40  4.32 4.30   5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  0  1  0 4.00  692/1323  4.00  3.96  4.00 4.08   4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 301  0101                University of Maryland                            Page 1586
Title        ADVANCED SPANISH I                 Baltimore County                              AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  NASH, LYLE                          Spring 2008                                  Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    21
Questionnaires:  12                    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  3  3  6  4.25  996/1670  4.03  4.36  4.31  4.24  4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  3  4  4  1  3.25 1577/1666  3.53  4.31  4.27  4.18  3.25
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    1   0  1  3  4  3  0  2.82 1382/1406  3.76  4.48  4.32  4.22  2.82
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  3  3  4  2  3.42 1491/1615  3.76  4.34  4.24  4.18  3.42
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  2  2  3  5  3.92  994/1566  4.07  4.26  4.07  4.04  3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  1  4  1  6  4.00  899/1528  4.05  4.23  4.12  4.07  4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  3  3  3  2  3.17 1559/1650  3.28  4.16  4.22  4.12  3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  3  8  1  3.83 1620/1667  3.97  4.47  4.67  4.67  3.83
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  5  4  2  3.73 1275/1626  3.70  4.08  4.11  4.06  3.73


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         1   0  1  0  1  6  3  3.91 1352/1559  3.84  4.38  4.46  4.40  3.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1   0  0  0  1  0 10  4.82  829/1560  4.85  4.75  4.72  4.67  4.82
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1   0  1  0  1  2  7  4.27  960/1549  4.07  4.34  4.31  4.25  4.27
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      1   0  0  2  1  3  5  4.00 1139/1546  3.75  4.40  4.32  4.24  4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2  4  2  1  1  1  1  2.67 1259/1323  3.65  3.96  4.00  3.99  2.67


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  0  2  8  4.80  221/1384  4.65  4.29  4.10  4.12  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2   0  0  0  0  0 10  5.00    1/1378  4.88  4.56  4.29  4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  1  0  9  4.80  386/1378  4.84  4.45  4.31  4.33  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   0  0  0  1  2  7  4.60  202/ 904  4.63  4.11  4.03  4.03  4.60


              Laboratory
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material  11   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 232  ****  ****  4.19  4.04  ****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information 11 0 0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/ 239  ****  ****  4.21  3.99  ****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities 11  0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 230  ****  ****  4.44  4.25  ****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance           11   0  0  0  0  1  0  4.00 ****/ 231  ****  ****  4.31  4.11  ****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified 11   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/ 218  ****  ****  4.18  3.93  ****


              Self  Paced
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11  0  1  0  0  0  0  1.00 ****/  28  ****  ****  4.64  3.33  ****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful      11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  27  ****  ****  4.54  2.63  ****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful       11   0  0  0  1  0  0  3.00 ****/  10  ****  ****  4.84  ****  ****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students     11   0  0  1  0  0  0  2.00 ****/   6  ****  ****  4.92  ****  ****

                                    Frequency Distribution


Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                Type                 Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      0      0.00-0.99   0      A    3      Required for Majors   0      Graduate      0      Major        2
  28-55      4      1.00-1.99   0      B    5
  56-83      1      2.00-2.99   1      C    1      General               2      Under-grad   12      Non-major   10
  84-150     2      3.00-3.49   0      D    0
  Grad.      0      3.50-4.00   8      F    0      Electives             1      #### - Means there are not enough
                                      P    0                                   responses to be significant
                                      I    0      Other                 5
                                      ?    1
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 301  0201            University of Maryland                            Page 1587
Title       ADVANCED SPANISH I             Baltimore County                           AUG  6, 2008
Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT                   Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   14
Questionnaires: 10                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  1  0  2  4  3  3.80 1414/1670  4.03  4.36  4.31  4.24  3.80
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  1  6  2  3.80 1383/1666  3.53  4.31  4.27  4.18  3.80
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1  8  4.70  387/1406  3.76  4.48  4.32  4.22  4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  1  1  4  4  4.10 1028/1615  3.76  4.34  4.24  4.18  4.10
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  1  0  1  0  4  4  4.22  675/1566  4.07  4.26  4.07  4.04  4.22
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 1 1 4 4  4.10  842/1528  4.05  4.23  4.12  4.07  4.10
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  1  2  5  1  3.40 1503/1650  3.28  4.16  4.22  4.12  3.40
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  9  1  4.10 1472/1667  3.97  4.47  4.67  4.67  4.10
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 1 3 3 2  3.67 1312/1626  3.70  4.08  4.11  4.06  3.67


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  1  2  4  2  3.78 1403/1559  3.84  4.38  4.46  4.40  3.78
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  1  8  4.89  647/1560  4.85  4.75  4.72  4.67  4.89
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2  0  0  0  3  3  2  3.88 1251/1549  4.07  4.34  4.31  4.25  3.88
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     2   0  1  0  2  4  1  3.50 1379/1546  3.75  4.40  4.32  4.24  3.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 0 3 5  4.63  260/1323  3.65  3.96  4.00  3.99  4.63


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  4  4  4.50  434/1384  4.65  4.29  4.10  4.12  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  2  6  4.75  400/1378  4.88  4.56  4.29  4.30  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0 0 0 0 1 7  4.88  312/1378  4.84  4.45  4.31  4.33  4.88
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   2  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  179/ 904  4.63  4.11  4.03  4.03  4.67


                              Frequency Distribution

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

Title   ADVANCED SPANISH II   Baltimore County   AUG 6, 2008
Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT   Spring 2008   Job IRBR3029
Enrollment: 12
Questionnaires: 7   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  1  0  0  4  2  3.86 1379/1670  4.43  4.36  4.31  4.24  3.86
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  1  0  0  4  2  3.86 1350/1666  4.29  4.31  4.27  4.18  3.86
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57  525/1406  4.57  4.48  4.32  4.22  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  1  0  0  1  5  4.29  837/1615  4.50  4.34  4.24  4.18  4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  258/1566  4.79  4.26  4.07  4.04  4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0  0  0  4  3  4.43  532/1528  4.64  4.23  4.12  4.07  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  1  0  2  1  3  3.71 1382/1650  3.93  4.16  4.22  4.12  3.71
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0  0  0  0  7  0  4.00 1524/1667  4.00  4.47  4.67  4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 1  0  0  4  1  3.67 1312/1626  3.93  4.08  4.11  4.06  3.67


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33 1092/1559  4.38  4.38  4.46  4.40  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67 1090/1560  4.69  4.75  4.72  4.67  4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  683/1549  4.39  4.34  4.31  4.25  4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  715/1546  4.61  4.40  4.32  4.24  4.50
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 0  0  1  0  1  4  4.33  481/1323  3.92  3.96  4.00  3.99  4.33


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  1  0  0  1  2  3.75  996/1384  4.18  4.29  4.10  4.12  3.75
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3  0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75  400/1378  4.75  4.56  4.29  4.30  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0  1  0  0  0  3  4.00  977/1378  4.40  4.45  4.31  4.33  4.00
4. Were special techniques successful                  3   0  0  0  1  2  1  4.00  461/ 904  4.33  4.11  4.03  4.03  4.00
```

Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 302  0201            University of Maryland                         Page 1589
Title       ADVANCED SPANISH II             Baltimore County                             AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  NASH, LYLE                       Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:  11
Questionnaires:  7             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  0  0  7  5.00    1/1670  4.43 4.36  4.31 4.24  5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   355/1666 4.29 4.31  4.27 4.18  4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57   525/1406 4.57 4.48  4.32 4.22  4.57
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   326/1615 4.50 4.34  4.24 4.18  4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   159/1566 4.79 4.26  4.07 4.04  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   147/1528 4.64 4.23  4.12 4.07  4.86
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  1  0  1  0  5  4.14  1032/1650 3.93 4.16  4.22 4.12  4.14
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  7  0  4.00  1524/1667 4.00 4.47  4.67 4.67  4.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 0  0  0  1  2  2  4.20   797/1626 3.93 4.08  4.11 4.06  4.20


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43   996/1559 4.38 4.38  4.46 4.40  4.43
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71  1023/1560 4.69 4.75  4.72 4.67  4.71
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29   952/1549 4.39 4.34  4.31 4.25  4.29
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   457/1546 4.61 4.40  4.32 4.24  4.71
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  0  2  2  0  3.50  1040/1323 3.92 3.96  4.00 3.99  3.50


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60   372/1384 4.18 4.29  4.10 4.12  4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  0  1  3  4.75   400/1378 4.75 4.56  4.29 4.30  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   386/1378 4.40 4.45  4.31 4.33  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                   2   2  0  0  0  1  2  4.67   179/ 904 4.33 4.11  4.03 4.03  4.67

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 304  0101              University of Maryland                         Page 1590
Title       SPAN:FOR HERITAGE SPEA           Baltimore County                            AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:    SCHWARTZ, ANA-M               Spring 2008                                 Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    8
Questionnaires:  6                 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  1  2  3  4.33  902/1670  4.33  4.36  4.31  4.24  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  870/1666  4.33  4.31  4.27  4.18  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals  0   0  0  0  2  0  4  4.33  799/1406  4.33  4.48  4.32  4.22  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  552/1615  4.50  4.34  4.24  4.18  4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  2  3  4.33  559/1566  4.33  4.26  4.07  4.04  4.33
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 3  4.50  421/1528  4.50  4.23  4.12  4.07  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained           0   0  0  1  3  2  0  3.17 1559/1650  3.17  4.16  4.22  4.12  3.17
8. How many times was class cancelled                 0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.47  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0 0 0 1 3 2  4.17  831/1626  4.17  4.08  4.11  4.06  4.17


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared       1   0  0  0  0  2  3  4.60  772/1559  4.60  4.38  4.46  4.40  4.60
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject  1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  855/1560  4.80  4.75  4.72  4.67  4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1 0 0 0 0 1 4  4.80  294/1549  4.80  4.34  4.31  4.25  4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned    1   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  595/1546  4.60  4.40  4.32  4.24  4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1 2 0 0 0 2 1  4.33  481/1323  4.33  3.96  4.00  3.99  4.33


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3 0 0 0 0 1 2  4.67  324/1384  4.67  4.29  4.10  4.12  4.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3 0 0 0 0 0 3  5.00    1/1378  5.00  4.56  4.29  4.30  5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3 0 0 0 1 0 2  4.33  813/1378  4.33  4.45  4.31  4.33  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                 3   0  0  1  1  0  1  3.33  779/ 904  3.33  4.11  4.03  4.03  3.33

                                    Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 307  0101              University of Maryland                      Page 1591
Title      ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS                Baltimore County                       AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SINNIGEN, JOHN                     Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    13
Questionnaires:  7                    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  0  3  4  4.57   589/1670  4.57 4.36  4.31 4.24  4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57   529/1666  4.57 4.31  4.27 4.18  4.57
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1406  5.00 4.48  4.32 4.22  5.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57   477/1615  4.57 4.34  4.24 4.18  4.57
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   159/1566  4.86 4.26  4.07 4.04  4.86
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  0  1  2  4  4.43   532/1528  4.43 4.23  4.12 4.07  4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0  0  0  0  3  4  4.57   471/1650  4.57 4.16  4.22 4.12  4.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  1022/1667  4.67 4.47  4.67 4.67  4.67
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 1  0  0  0  3  3  4.50   403/1626  4.50 4.08  4.11 4.06  4.50


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   355/1559  4.86 4.38  4.46 4.40  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00     1/1560  5.00 4.75  4.72 4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  0  0  2  5  4.71   424/1549  4.71 4.34  4.31 4.25  4.71
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   288/1546  4.86 4.40  4.32 4.24  4.86
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0 0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86   137/1323  4.86 3.96  4.00 3.99  4.86


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  0  0  0  4  1  4.20   712/1384  4.20 4.29  4.10 4.12  4.20
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   348/1378  4.80 4.56  4.29 4.30  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2 0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80   386/1378  4.80 4.45  4.31 4.33  4.80
4. Were special techniques successful                  2   0  0  0  1  4  0  3.80   605/ 904  3.80 4.11  4.03 4.03  3.80

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 308  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1592
Title       LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU            Baltimore County                                  AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   STOLLE-MCALLIST                   Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   15
Questionnaires: 11                  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  0  2  9  4.82  290/1670  4.82  4.36  4.31  4.24  4.82
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  1  2  8  4.64  452/1666  4.64  4.31  4.27  4.18  4.64
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  191/1406  4.91  4.48  4.32  4.22  4.91
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  238/1615  4.82  4.34  4.24  4.18  4.82
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  132/1566  4.91  4.26  4.07  4.04  4.91
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  167/1528  4.82  4.23  4.12  4.07  4.82
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  3  8  4.73  298/1650  4.73  4.16  4.22  4.12  4.73
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0 11  5.00    1/1667  5.00  4.47  4.67  4.67  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3 0  0  0  0  3  5  4.63  308/1626  4.63  4.08  4.11  4.06  4.63


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1 10  4.91  276/1559  4.91  4.38  4.46  4.40  4.91
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73 1004/1560  4.73  4.75  4.72  4.67  4.73
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  410/1549  4.73  4.34  4.31  4.25  4.73
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  1  1  9  4.73  445/1546  4.73  4.40  4.32  4.24  4.73
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  0  0  0  3  7  4.70  217/1323  4.70  3.96  4.00  3.99  4.70


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3   0  0  0  0  1  7  4.88  184/1384  4.88  4.29  4.10  4.12  4.88
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 3   0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  400/1378  4.75  4.56  4.29  4.30  4.75
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 3  0  0  0  1  0  7  4.75  439/1378  4.75  4.45  4.31  4.33  4.75
4. Were special techniques successful                   3   0  0  0  2  1  5  4.38  305/ 904  4.38  4.11  4.03  4.03  4.38


                                    Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned          Cum. GPA         Expected Grades          Reasons                  Type                    Majors
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
  00-27      1        0.00-0.99    0      A    8        Required for Majors  1      Graduate     0        Major       6
  28-55      0        1.00-1.99    0      B    2                                                           
  56-83      0        2.00-2.99    0      C    0        General              1      Under-grad  11        Non-major   5
  84-150     3        3.00-3.49    1      D    0                                                           
  Grad.      0        3.50-4.00    3      F    0        Electives            0      #### - Means there are not enough
                                         P    0                                     responses to be significant
                                         I    0        Other                9
                                         ?    0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 311  0101            University of Maryland                         Page 1593
Title        INTRO TO SPANISH LIT          Baltimore County                          AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SLOANE, ROBERT                   Spring 2008                            Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     18
Questionnaires:  17             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  1  3  6  7  4.12 1150/1670  4.12 4.36  4.31 4.24  4.12
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0  0  2  6  3  6  3.76 1403/1666  3.76 4.31  4.27 4.18  3.76
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0  0  1  1  5 10  4.41  703/1406  4.41 4.48  4.32 4.22  4.41
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   0  2  1  4  3  7  3.71 1356/1615  3.71 4.34  4.24 4.18  3.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1  0  0  1  4  4  7  4.06  814/1566  4.06 4.26  4.07 4.04  4.06
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 2 0 0  3  3  4  5  3.73 1164/1528  3.73 4.23  4.12 4.07  3.73
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            1   0  4  4  2  2  4  2.88 1604/1650  2.88 4.16  4.22 4.12  2.88
8. How many times was class cancelled                  1   0  0  0  0 11  5  4.31 1326/1667  4.31 4.47  4.67 4.67  4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 2 1 0 0  4  6  4  4.00  953/1626  4.00 4.08  4.11 4.06  4.00


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        1   0  3  2  1  7  3  3.31 1491/1559  3.31 4.38  4.46 4.40  3.31
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   1   0  0  0  1  4 11  4.63 1138/1560  4.63 4.75  4.72 4.67  4.63
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 1  0  2  1  3  5  5  3.63 1358/1549  3.63 4.34  4.31 4.25  3.63
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     1   0  1  0  4  6  5  3.88 1244/1546  3.88 4.40  4.32 4.24  3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 2 0  0  5  4  4  3.92  794/1323  3.92 3.96  4.00 3.99  3.92


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 3  0  0  1  2  3  8  4.29  651/1384  4.29 4.29  4.10 4.12  4.29
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 4  0  0  1  1  3  8  4.38  740/1378  4.38 4.56  4.29 4.30  4.38
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 4  0  0  0  1  2 10  4.69  501/1378  4.69 4.45  4.31 4.33  4.69
4. Were special techniques successful                  5   0  1  1  1  6  3  3.75  629/ 904  3.75 4.11  4.03 4.03  3.75

                              Frequency Distribution

Credits Earned        Cum. GPA        Expected Grades         Reasons                 Type                    Majors
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
 00-27      0      0.00-0.99    0       A   9      Required for Majors   0     Graduate     0      Major         3
 28-55      2      1.00-1.99    0       B   3
 56-83      3      2.00-2.99    2       C   0      General               1     Under-grad  17      Non-major    14
 84-150     6      3.00-3.49    3       D   0
 Grad.      0      3.50-4.00    6       F   0      Electives             0     #### - Means there are not enough
                                        P   0                                 responses to be significant
                                        I   0      Other                13
                                        ?   0
```

```
Course-Section: SPAN 312  0101            University of Maryland                        Page 1594
Title         INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI        Baltimore County                         AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SCHNEIDER, JUDI               Spring 2008                              Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:   16
Questionnaires: 13              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  1  0  2  6  4  3.92 1318/1670  3.92  4.36  4.31 4.24  3.92
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0  0  0  0  5  2  6  4.08 1154/1666  4.08  4.31  4.27 4.18  4.08
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0  0  1  2  2  3  5  3.69 1228/1406  3.69  4.48  4.32 4.22  3.69
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0  0  1  2  2  4  4  3.62 1411/1615  3.62  4.34  4.24 4.18  3.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  3  5  4  3.92  978/1566  3.92  4.26  4.07 4.04  3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0  0  1  1  6  5  4.15  796/1528  4.15  4.23  4.12 4.07  4.15
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0  0  1  2  2  0  8  3.92 1249/1650  3.92  4.16  4.22 4.12  3.92
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0  0  0  0  0  3 10  4.77  909/1667  4.77  4.47  4.67 4.67  4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 3  0  0  0  6  3  1  3.50 1384/1626  3.50  4.08  4.11 4.06  3.50


                Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0  0  0  1  2  4  6  4.15 1224/1559  4.15  4.38  4.46 4.40  4.15
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    1  0  0  0  0  0 12  5.00    1/1560  5.00  4.75  4.72 4.67  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0  0  1  2  3  7  4.23  994/1549  4.23  4.34  4.31 4.25  4.23
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0  0  0  1  1  5  6  4.23 1002/1546  4.23  4.40  4.32 4.24  4.23
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  1  1  1  2  3  5  3.83  871/1323  3.83  3.96  4.00 3.99  3.83


                Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 2  0  1  0  2  2  6  4.09  798/1384  4.09  4.29  4.10 4.12  4.09
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 2  0  0  0  0  2  9  4.82  337/1378  4.82  4.56  4.29 4.30  4.82
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 2  0  0  1  2  2  6  4.18  904/1378  4.18  4.45  4.31 4.33  4.18
4. Were special techniques successful                   2  0  1  1  3  1  5  3.73  643/ 904  3.73  4.11  4.03 4.03  3.73

                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 401  0101                University of Maryland                                    Page 1595
Title        STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN             Baltimore County                                      AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  BELL, ALAN S                        Spring 2008                                          Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    12
Questionnaires:  6                     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   1   2   3  4.33   902/1670   4.33  4.36  4.31  4.45  4.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33   870/1666   4.33  4.31  4.27  4.35  4.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   3   0   0   1   0   2  4.33   799/1406   4.33  4.48  4.32  4.48  4.33
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0   0   1   0   1   4  4.33   775/1615   4.33  4.34  4.24  4.37  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   1   0   1   2   0   2  3.60  1230/1566   3.60  4.26  4.07  4.17  3.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   1   1   4  4.50   421/1528   4.50  4.23  4.12  4.26  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0   0   0   1   0   5  4.67   361/1650   4.67  4.16  4.22  4.28  4.67
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0   0   0   0   0   6  5.00     1/1667   5.00  4.47  4.67  4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 0 0   0   0   2   2   2  4.00   953/1626   4.00  4.08  4.11  4.28  4.00


                 Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  1092/1559   4.33  4.38  4.46  4.58  4.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0   0   1   0   1   4  4.33  1376/1560   4.33  4.75  4.72  4.80  4.33
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0   0   0   2   0   4  4.33   900/1549   4.33  4.34  4.31  4.43  4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0   0   1   0   2   3  4.17  1056/1546   4.17  4.40  4.32  4.43  4.17
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  2   0   0   0   3   1  4.25   545/1323   4.25  3.96  4.00  4.10  4.25


                 Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 0   0   0   0   3   1   2  3.83   962/1384   3.83  4.29  4.10  4.32  3.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 0   0   0   0   0   3   3  4.50   603/1378   4.50  4.56  4.29  4.55  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 0  0   0   0   3   1   2  3.83  1076/1378   3.83  4.45  4.31  4.60  3.83
4. Were special techniques successful                   0   1   0   0   1   1   3  4.40   289/ 904   4.40  4.11  4.03  4.22  4.40

                                 Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 421  0101            University of Maryland                              Page 1596
Title       STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI          Baltimore County                                 AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:   SINNIGEN, JOHN                  Spring 2008                                     Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:    11
Questionnaires:  7                  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  3  1  3  4.00 1216/1670  4.00 4.36  4.31 4.45  4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  1  4  4.29  931/1666  4.29 4.31  4.27 4.35  4.29
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  1  0  6  4.71  363/1406  4.71 4.48  4.32 4.48  4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   1  0  0  1  0  5  4.67  379/1615  4.67 4.34  4.24 4.37  4.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  1  1  5  4.57  354/1566  4.57 4.26  4.07 4.17  4.57
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  3  3  4.29  679/1528  4.29 4.23  4.12 4.26  4.29
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             1   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  570/1650  4.50 4.16  4.22 4.28  4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1667  5.00 4.47  4.67 4.73  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  1  5  0  3.83 1191/1626  3.83 4.08  4.11 4.28  3.83


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1  6  4.86  355/1559  4.86 4.38  4.46 4.58  4.86
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  7  5.00    1/1560  5.00 4.75  4.72 4.80  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  2  2  3  4.14 1070/1549  4.14 4.34  4.31 4.43  4.14
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  3  0  4  4.14 1071/1546  4.14 4.40  4.32 4.43  4.14
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 1  2  0  2  1  0  1  3.00 1179/1323  3.00 3.96  4.00 4.10  3.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  434/1384  4.50 4.29  4.10 4.32  4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  0  3  3  4.50  603/1378  4.50 4.56  4.29 4.55  4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  0  4  2  4.33  813/1378  4.33 4.45  4.31 4.60  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   0  0  1  2  1  2  3.67  671/ 904  3.67 4.11  4.03 4.22  3.67


                                       Frequency Distribution

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

```
                                                    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   1   0   3   2   1  3.29 1593/1670  3.29  4.36  4.31  4.45  3.29
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals    0   0   1   0   2   3   1  3.43 1536/1666  3.43  4.31  4.27  4.35  3.43
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals   0   0   0   1   0   3   3  4.14  964/1406  4.14  4.48  4.32  4.48  4.14
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals    0   1   1   1   0   3   1  3.33 1512/1615  3.33  4.34  4.24  4.37  3.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0  0   0   0   2   2   3  4.14  752/1566  4.14  4.26  4.07  4.17  4.14
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0   2   0   3   2  3.71 1176/1528  3.71  4.23  4.12  4.26  3.71
7. Was the grading system clearly explained            0   0   2   2   1   1   1  2.57 1621/1650  2.57  4.16  4.22  4.28  2.57
8. How many times was class cancelled                  0   0   0   1   1   5   0  3.57 1646/1667  3.57  4.47  4.67  4.73  3.57
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  1   0   1   3   1  3.50 1384/1626  3.50  4.08  4.11  4.28  3.50


                  Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared        0   0   1   1   1   3   1  3.29 1494/1559  3.29  4.38  4.46  4.58  3.29
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject   0   0   0   1   1   0   5  4.29 1403/1560  4.29  4.75  4.72  4.80  4.29
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0  0   1   1   0   4   1  3.43 1422/1549  3.43  4.34  4.31  4.43  3.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned     0   0   2   0   0   2   3  3.57 1361/1546  3.57  4.40  4.32  4.43  3.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0  1   1   1   1   1  3.00 1179/1323  3.00  3.96  4.00  4.10  3.00


                  Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1  0   0   1   1   3   1  3.67 1033/1384  3.67  4.29  4.10  4.32  3.67
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1  0   0   0   1   2   3  4.33  797/1378  4.33  4.56  4.29  4.55  4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1 0  0   0   1   2   3  4.33  813/1378  4.33  4.45  4.31  4.60  4.33
4. Were special techniques successful                  1   2   0   1   1   1   1  3.50  718/ 904  3.50  4.11  4.03  4.22  3.50
```

                                              Frequency Distribution

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

```
Course-Section: SPAN 621  0101              University of Maryland                              Page 1598
Title        STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI          Baltimore County                                AUG  6, 2008
Instructor:  SINNIGEN, JOHN                  Spring 2008                                      Job IRBR3029
Enrollment:     7
Questionnaires:  6                   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  0  2  4  4.67  479/1670  4.67 4.36  4.31 4.46  4.67
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals     0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  233/1666  4.83 4.31  4.27 4.34  4.83
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals    0   0  0  0  0  2  4  4.67  423/1406  4.67 4.48  4.32 4.36  4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals     0   0  0  0  2  0  4  4.33  775/1615  4.33 4.34  4.24 4.33  4.33
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0   0  0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  170/1566  4.83 4.26  4.07 4.20  4.83
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0  0  0  1  1  4  4.50  421/1528  4.50 4.23  4.12 4.33  4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained             0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1650  5.00 4.16  4.22 4.30  5.00
8. How many times was class cancelled                   0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1667  5.00 4.47  4.67 4.74  5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  167/1626  4.80 4.08  4.11 4.20  4.80


              Lecture
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared         0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  387/1559  4.83 4.38  4.46 4.49  4.83
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject    0   0  0  0  0  0  6  5.00    1/1560  5.00 4.75  4.72 4.81  5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  266/1549  4.83 4.34  4.31 4.37  4.83
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned      0   0  0  0  0  1  5  4.83  310/1546  4.83 4.40  4.32 4.40  4.83
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 0  0  0  0  2  2  2  4.00  692/1323  4.00 3.96  4.00 4.03  4.00


              Discussion
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  221/1384  4.80 4.29  4.10 4.21  4.80
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 1   0  0  0  0  1  4  4.80  348/1378  4.80 4.56  4.29 4.42  4.80
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 1  0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  590/1378  4.60 4.45  4.31 4.51  4.60
4. Were special techniques successful                   1   0  0  0  1  0  4  4.60  202/ 904  4.60 4.11  4.03 4.04  4.60


              Seminar
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme 5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  87  **** 5.00  4.65 4.61  ****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention 5  0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.63  4.64 4.67  ****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  75  **** 5.00  4.57 4.66  ****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned     5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  79  **** 4.88  4.45 4.58  ****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear                 5   0  0  0  0  0  1  5.00 ****/  80  **** 4.13  3.97 4.32  ****


                                    Frequency Distribution

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