Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: KING, ROBIN R

Enrollment: 30

Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1486 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies In				Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		_	Mean		Mear
General	_					_								
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	3	6	15	4.40	787/1576		4.34	4.30	4.11	4.40
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	2	0	0	0	2	5	16	4.61	476/1576		4.32	4.27	4.18	4.61
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	6	17	4.60	480/1342		4.48	4.32	4.19	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	5	17	4.63	376/1520		4.30	4.25	4.09	4.63
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	2	8	13	4.38	537/1465	4.31	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.38
5. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned		1	0	1	4	9	10	4.17	777/1434	4.20	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.17
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	5	17	4.56	457/1547	4.36	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.56
3. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	19	6	4.24	1339/1574	4.45	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.24
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	5	9	4.35	597/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.35
Lecture														
l. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	3	4	17	4.58	774/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.58
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	22	4.92	501/1493	4.82	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.9
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	2	3	18	4.70	422/1486		4.33	4.32	4.26	4.7
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	4	18	4.58	602/1489	4.58	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.5
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	6	0	1	2	3	10	4.38	429/1277		3.99	4.03	3.91	
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	2	0	5	10	4.35	589/1279	4.52	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.3
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	523/1270	4.68	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.6
	8	0	0	0	1	6	10	4.53	632/12/0	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.5
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	8	1	0	2	1	_	7		,					
4. Were special techniques successful	8	1	U	2	1	6	/	4.13	435/ 878	4.43	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.1
Laboratory														
l. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	***
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	1 24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	***
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	***
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	* * *
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.0
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	***
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	***
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	24	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	***
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	24	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	***
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	1	24	4.96	53/ 326		4.99	4.03	3.64	4.9
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00
WY20	ruenc	z Die	trih	ntio	n									
1160	140110]													

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	16	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	6	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	25	Non-major	25
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F P	0 1	Electives	1	#### - Means responses to		are not enough gnificant	1

I 0 Other 3 ? 2

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: KING, ROBIN R

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 21

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1487 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Fre	eaner	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept.	UMBC	Level	Sect
Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	7	13	4.57	541/1576	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.57
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	462/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.62
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	345/1342	4.59	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	2	4	15	4.62	385/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.62
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	7	10	4.24	668/1465	4.31	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.24
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	3	5	12	4.33	594/1434	4.20	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	3	15	4.48	575/1547	4.36	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.48
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.45	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	1	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	331/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.59
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	18	4.76	484/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.76
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	3	18	4.86	683/1493	4.82	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	468/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.67
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	3	16	4.57	614/1489	4.58	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.57
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	2	1	2	3	3	10	4.00	692/1277	4.16	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	381/1279	4.52	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.60
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	1		12	4.73	435/1270	4.68	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.73
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	12	4.73	467/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.73
4. Were special techniques successful	6	0	0	1	1	3	10	4.47	245/ 878	4.43	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.47
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	19	1	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	****
Seminar	0.0	0	0	•	-	_	0	2 00	****	als als als als	4 60	4 50	4 50	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.52	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	20	U	0	U	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work														
	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	2 00	****/ 52	***	г оо	4 40	4 00	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	20		-	0	1	0	0		,	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	20	0	0		1		0		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	20	-	0	-	1	-	•		****/ 45		5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 326	4.96	4.99	4.03	3.64	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	20	0	0	0	1	0	0	3 00	****/ 40	***	5.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.44	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 28	****	5.00	4.67	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.78	3.86	****
J. WELE CHIEFE ENOUGH PROCEOUS FOR ALL CHE SCUGENES	∠0	U	U	U	Τ.	U	U	3.00	/ 302	5.00	ユ・フフ	4.00	3.00	

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: KING, ROBIN R

Enrollment: 29
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1487 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	ts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Reasons		Type		Majors		
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	6	Required for Majors	11	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	11						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C	2	General	2	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	6	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	1			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0301 Univ

Instructor: MIRANDA-ALDACO,

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 21

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1488 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

	1			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	4	14	4.60	500/1576	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	2	6	12	4.50	608/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	6	13	4.60	480/1342	4.59	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.60
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	3	4	12	4.47	562/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.47
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	3	0	0	2	7	8	4.35	554/1465	4.31	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.35
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	1	0	2	4	5	8	4.00	878/1434	4.20	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	2	9	8	4.20	900/1547	4.36	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.20
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	1	12	7	4.30	1288/1574	4.45	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.30
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	7	2	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	263/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.67
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	3	0	0	0	2	5	11	4.50	870/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	3	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	966/1493	4.82	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.72
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	0	0	1	10	7	4.33	891/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	0	0	5	13	4.72	420/1489	4.58	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.72
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	3	0	0	2	7	6	4.27	524/1277	4.16	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.27
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	11	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	312/1279	4.52	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.70
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1270	4.68	4.57	4.35	4.09	5.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.80
4. Were special techniques successful	11	2	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/ 878	4.43	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.88
		_	,	3	Ü	_	•		, 0,0	10		05	,-	00

Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	А	9	Required for Majors	10	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C	2	General	1	Under-grad	21	Non-major	21
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	ı
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4				
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 101 0401 Title

ELEMENTARY SPANISH I

Instructor: MIRANDA-ALDACO,

Enrollment: 28 Questionnaires: 24

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1489 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

	1			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	Λ	2	Λ	1	6	14	4.30	893/1576	4.47	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.30
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	2	0	6	15	4.48	653/1576	4.55	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.48
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	1	1	8	13	4.43	671/1342	4.59	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.43
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	3	1	0	2	7	11	4.29	826/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	0	1	5	4	13	4.26	637/1465	4.31	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.26
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	1	2	5	14	4.30	625/1434	4.20	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.30
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	1	2	0	3	4	14	4.22	882/1547	4.36	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.22
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	17	7	4.29	1295/1574	4.45	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.29
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	1	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	532/1554		4.13	4.10	4.01	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	2	2	4	14	4.36	1025/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.36
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	1	0	2	19	4.77	868/1493	4.82	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.77
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	8	12	4.41	821/1486	4.53	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.41
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	0	1	6	14	4.45	754/1489	4.58	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.45
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	1	1	3	7	8	4.00	692/1277	4.16	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	12	0	1	0	0	3	8	4.42	543/1279	4.52	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.42
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	12	0	1	0	1	2	8	4.33	784/1270	4.68	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.33
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	12	0	1	0	2	1	8	4.25	819/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.25
4. Were special techniques successful	12	4	1	0	0	2	5	4.25	367/ 878	4.43	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.25

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	А	10	Required for Majors	13	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	8						
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	0	C	2	General	0	Under-grad	24	Non-major	24
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	8	F	0	Electives	2	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	5				
				?	1						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: BURGOS, FELIX A

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1490 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

	Questions						_	ncie		_		ructor		Dept		Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General															
1. Did yo	u gain ne	w insights, skills for	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	727/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.44
		tor make clear the		0	0	1	0	1	3	13	4.50	608/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.50
3. Did th	ie exam qu	estions reflect the	expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	14	4.67	406/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.67
4. Did ot	her evalu	ations reflect the e	expected goals	0	0	1	0	1	6	10	4.33	768/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.33
5. Did as	signed re	adings contribute to	what you learned	0	1	2	2	2	5	6	3.65	1180/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.65
		signments contribute		0	1	1	1	2	4	9	4.12	826/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.12
		system clearly exp	lained	0	0	0	2	3	3	10	4.17	924/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.17
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	13	5		1309/1574		4.55	4.64	4.59	4.28
9. How wo	uld you g	grade the overall tea	aching effectiveness	1	0	0	1	1	10	5	4.12	860/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.12
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures well	prepared	2	0	1	0	1	5	9	4.31	1064/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.31
2. Did th	e instruc	tor seem interested	in the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	15	4.88	632/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.88
3. Was le	cture mat	erial presented and	explained clearly	2	0	0	1	1	4	10	4.44	778/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.44
4. Did th	e lecture	es contribute to what	you learned	2	0	0	1	1	1	13	4.63	552/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.63
5. Did au	. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understandin				2	1	0	2	4	7	4.14	623/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.14
	Discussion																
1. Did cl	ass discu	ussions contribute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	5.00
		its actively encourage	2	9	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270		4.57	4.35	4.09	4.89
		tor encourage fair a		9	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1269		4.38	4.35	4.09	5.00
		chniques successful	and open disoussion	9	1	0	1	0	1	6	4.50	221/ 878		4.19	4.05		4.50
		Field Work															
E Did ao	nforongo	s help you carry out	field agtivities	16	0	0	0	0	0	2	E 00	****/ 326	E 00	1 00	4 02	2 61	****
J. Dia co	niterences	neip you carry out	Tield accivities	10	U	U	U	U	U	2	3.00	/ 320	5.00	4.33	4.03	3.04	
		Self Paced											= 00				
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for all	the students	17	0	0	0	0	0	Τ	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****
			Frequ	iency	Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	 5	0.00-0.99 0	A 5		 Re	 quir		or M	 aior	 a 1	0	 Graduat		0	Majo		1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99 0	B 10		1/6/	2011	JU II	OI 111	۱۰ ۲	S 1	. •	Gradat	_	J	1.10.10	<i>,</i> _	_
56-83	2	2.00-2.99 3	C 2		Ger	nera:	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	17
84-150						u.	-				_	onder 9	1	. •	1,011		
	Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					ectiv	ves				0	#### -	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh
oraa.	Ü	2330 1.00	P 0								-	respons				_	,
			I O		Ot.1	her					5	10050110		91			
			? 0														

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: BURGOS, FELIX A

Enrollment: 31
Questionnaires: 17

RGOS, FELIX A Spring 2009

Page 1491 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

		2			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect				
	Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
	General														
1 Did von gain new	insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	1	2	13	4.59	527/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.59
1 5	or make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	4.65	420/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.65
	stions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	500/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.59
_	tions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	4	12	4.59	418/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.59
	dings contribute to what you learned	0	2	0	1	4	3	7	4.07	818/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.07
_	gnments contribute to what you learne	d 0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	511/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.41
7. Was the grading	system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	7	10	4.59	434/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.59
8. How many times w	vas class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	13	4	4.24	1339/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.24
9. How would you gr	ade the overall teaching effectivenes	s 4	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	187/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.77
	Lecture														
1. Were the instruc	tor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	3	12	4.80	401/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.80
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject				0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.93
	3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly				0	0	4	11	4.73	366/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.73
	contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	240/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.87
5. Did audiovisual	techniques enhance your understanding	2	4	0	0	2	1	8	4.55	288/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.55
	Discussion														
1. Did class discus	sions contribute to what you learned	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	413/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.56
	s actively encouraged to participate	8	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	597/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.56
	or encourage fair and open discussion	9	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	567/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.63
4. Were special tec	hniques successful	8	1	0	0	1	2	5	4.50	221/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.50
	Field Work														
5. Did conferences	help you carry out field activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	****
	Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students			0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****
	quency	, Dis	trib	utio:	n										
Credits Earned	ts Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades						s			Ty	pe			Majors	

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Туре		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	A	3	Required for Majors	4	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	1	В	8						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	2	Under-grad	17	Non-major	17
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	0	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6	-			
				2	Λ						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA

Institution: Quino

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1492 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equen 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		
General 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	5	7	1	2 04	1213/1576	4.23	4.34	4 20	4.11	3.94
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	1	0	4	6	5		1253/1576	4.23	4.34	4.27	4.11	3.88
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	4	6	-	4.13	925/1342			4.32	4.19	4.13
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	1	3	5	7	4.13		4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.13
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	3	2	6	-		1221/1465	3.81		4.12	4.02	3.56
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	2	4	0	5	5		1245/1434		4.22	4.14	3.94	3.44
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	1	1	5	8	4.13	955/1547	4.12		4.19	4.10	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	3			645/1574		4.55	4.64	4.59	4.81
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	0	0	3	8			1110/1554		4.13		4.01	
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	1	2	8	3	3.93	1299/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	3.93
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	5	9		1077/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.64
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	3	0	1	1	2	5	4		1249/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.77
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	1	2	0	5	6	3.93	1177/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	3.93
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	1	2	1	3	1	5	3.50	1020/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	5	1	5	4.00	802/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	7	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	696/1270		4.57	4.35	4.09	4.44
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	7	0	0	1	1	1	6	4.33	773/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.33
4. Were special techniques successful	7	2	1	0	0	4	2	3.86	580/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	3.86
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	***
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	4.11	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: QUIROGA, MARIA

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 16

QUIROGA, MARIA

Spring 2009

Page 1492 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	4	Required for Majors	7	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	3	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	16	Non-major	15
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-		_	
				?	0						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: COYNE, MARIA

The column to th

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 18

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1493 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

							Fr	equei	ncies			Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		General	 1															
1. Did voi	u gain ne	w insights,ski		this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	10	4.44	727/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.44
		tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	13	4.67	392/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.67
		estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	3	14	4.72	333/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.72
4. Did otl	her evalu	ations reflect	the exp	pected goals	0	0	0	0	1	6	11	4.56	453/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.56
5. Did ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to w	hat you learned	1	1	1	2	4	4	5	3.63	1194/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.63
6. Did wr	itten ass	ignments contri	ibute to	what you learned	1	1	0	1	4	5	6	4.00	878/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.00
7. Was the	e grading	system clearly	y explai	ned	1	0	0	0	3	6	8	4.29	794/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.29
8. How man	ny times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	739/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.76
9. How wor	uld you g	rade the overa	ll teach	ning effectiveness	2	0	0	0	4	5	7	4.19	783/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.19
		Lecture	е															
1. Were th	he instru	ctor's lectures	s well p	prepared	1	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	982/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.41
2. Did the	e instruc	tor seem intere	ested in	the subject	1	0	0	0	0	3	14	4.82	759/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.82
3. Was led	cture mat	erial presented	d and ex	plained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	5	10	4.47	720/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.47
4. Did the	e lecture	s contribute to	o what y	ou learned	1	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	602/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.59
5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques enl	nance yo	our understanding	1	4	0	0	3	7	3	4.00	692/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cla	agg digon			hat you learned	7	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	419/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.55
				to participate	7	0	0	0	0	2	9		345/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.82
				l open discussion	7	0	0	1	0	5	-	4.27	808/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.27
		chniques succes		Copen alboabbion	8	1	1	0	1	3		4.00	464/ 878		4.19		3.91	
		Semina	r															
5. Were c	riteria f	or grading made	=		0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00
			,															
5 Did co	nferences	Field Whelp you carry		eld activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 326	5 00	4 99	4 N3	3.64	5 00
J. Dia con	III CI CIICCB	ncip you carr	y out 11	cera accivicies	Ü	O	O	O	O	O	10	3.00	1/ 520	3.00	1.00	1.03	3.01	3.00
E 17 t.1	1	Self 1			0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	F 00	1 / 200	F 00	4 00	4 00	2 06	F 00
5. Were ti	nere enou	gh proctors for	r all tr	ie students	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	า									
Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Туј	рe			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	 0	 A 7				 ed f	or Ma		 g 1	1	Graduat		0	Majo		0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	B 9		1/6/	1411	cu I	JI Ma	דטנ	D I		Graduati	_	U	Ma JC	, <u>.</u>	U
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	2	C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	major	18
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	3	D 0		001	C_ u	_				-	011401 9.	1		2.011		_0
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ecti [.]	ves				0	#### - I	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
				P 0									response				_	
				I 0		Otl	ner					4	_		3			
				? 0														

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: NASH, LYLE

Enrollment: 22
Questionnaires: 17

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1494 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	1	4	4	3	5	3.41	1478/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	3.41
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	5	1	4	3	4	3.00	1523/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	4	3	4	5	3.47	1221/1342		4.48	4.32	4.19	3.47
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	3	2	7			1336/1520		4.30	4.25	4.09	3.59
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	3	3	5			1242/1465		4.26	4.12		3.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	1	3	3	3	3			1353/1434		4.22	4.14		3.13
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	2	3	2	6			1376/1547			4.19		3.41
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	9			1115/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.47
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	2	1	4	5	2	3.29	1381/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	3.29
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	2	2	1	5	6	3.69	1365/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	3.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	1	1	0	6	9	4.24	1362/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.24
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	2	1	2	4	7	3.81	1229/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	3.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	2	1	6	6	3.88	1205/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	3.88
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	8	0	1	2	4	0	3.43	1056/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.43
Discussion	4	0	0	3	1	_	2	3.69	000/1070	1 26	4.30	4 17	2 06	2 (0
 Did class discussions contribute to what you learned Were all students actively encouraged to participate 	4 4	0	0	2	1	6 5		4.00	989/1279 928/1270	4.36	4.57	4.17	3.96 4.09	3.69 4.00
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	1	2	3	-	4.00	928/12/0	4.54		4.35	4.09	4.00
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	1	0	0	5 6		4.17		4.32			3.91	
4. Were special techniques successful	3	U		U	U	O	5	4.1/	415/ 6/6	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.1/
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****		4.23	4.08	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	16	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	16	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	***	5.00	4.51	4.43	***
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	****
Field Work	1.0	0	0	0	0	0	1	г оо	****/ 326	г оо	4 00	4 02	2 (1	++++
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	16	U	U	U	U	U	Т	5.00	***/ 320	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	13	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	***
Frequ	encv	Dist	ribu	ıtior	ı									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ту	pe			Majors	
00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 3		Rec	 quire	ed fo	or Ma	jors	1	1	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	1
28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 7														
56-83 4 2.00-2.99 0 C 6		Ger	neral	_				1	Under-g	rad 1	7	Non-	major	16
84-150 0 3.00-3.49 2 D 0									_				-	
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 2 F 0		$El\epsilon$	ectiv	res				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	h
Р 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
I 0		Oth	ner					3						
? 0														

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI

Enrollment:

27 Questionnaires: 23 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1495 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	3	0	0	0	3	9	8	4.25	952/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.25
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	3	0	0	0	3	5	12	4.45	698/1576		4.32	4.27	4.18	4.45
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	0	6	13	4.55	531/1342		4.48	4.32	4.19	4.55
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	3	0	0	1	3	8	8		953/1520		4.30	4.25	4.09	4.15
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	3	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.00	850/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	3	0	1	0	8	3	8	3.85	1033/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	3.85
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	3	0	1	1	3	4	11	4.15	932/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.15
8. How many times was class cancelled	3	0	0	0	0	1	19	4.95	281/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	3	6	6	4.20	772/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.20
Lecture														
	-	0	0	1	2	2	10	1 11	045/1400	1 20	4 20	1 17	1 11	1 11
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	5	0	0	1	2	3	12	4.44	945/1488		4.39	4.47	4.41	
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	5 6	-	0	0	1 4	2		4.78	868/1493		4.78	4.73	4.65	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	6	0	-	-	4	5	8	4.24	973/1486		4.33	4.32	4.26	4.24
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	3	3 6	12		696/1489		4.40	4.32	4.22	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	/	U	Τ	U	4	ь	5	3.88	818/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	3.88
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	14	0	0	0	3	5	1	3.78	952/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	3.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	14	0	0	1	2	3	3	3.89	1011/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	3.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	14	0	0	1	2	4	2	3.78	1029/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	3.78
4. Were special techniques successful	14	0	0	0	1	5	3	4.22	383/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.22
Seminar														
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	21	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	***
-														
Self Paced	0.1	0	•	•	•	0	0	F 00	**** / 222	F 00	4 00	4 00	2 06	de de de d
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	21	0	U	U	U	0	2	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	****
_			٠,											

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	 6	Required for Majors	9	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	23	Non-major	23
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	4	-	-	-	
				2	0						

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI

Enrollment:

26 Questionnaires: 16 Spring 2009

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Page 1496 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

				Fre	eauer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
	Ouestions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean		Mean	
	General														
1.	Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	4.75	301/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.75
2.	Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	448/1576	4.21	4.32	4.27	4.18	4.63
3.	Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	455/1342	4.41	4.48	4.32	4.19	4.63
4.	Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	2	6	7	4.33	768/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.33
5.	Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	1	1	0	3	2	9	4.20	708/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	4.20
6.	Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	4	0	0	0	4	8	4.67	270/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.67
7.	Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	4	11	4.63	387/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.63
8.	How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	5.00
9.	How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	237/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.69
	Lecture														
1.	Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	3	11	4.56	798/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.56
	Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	5.00	1/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	5.00
	Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	561/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.60
	Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2		4.87		4.41		4.32		4.87
	Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	1	0	0	2	0		4.71					3.91	
										,					
	Discussion														
	Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	3	8	4.73	287/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.73
	Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1		4.91	260/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.91
	Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	1		4.73	479/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.73
4.	Were special techniques successful	5	1	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	129/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.80
	Laboratory														
1.	Did the lab increase understanding of the material	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.08	****
3.	Were necessary materials available for lab activities	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****
4.	Did the lab instructor provide assistance	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.27	****
5.	Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.15	****
	Seminar														
1.	Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.52	****
	Did research projects contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.43	****
	Did presentations contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.55	****
	Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00		4.01	3.78	5.00
-	Field Work	1 -	0	0	0	0	•	-	F 00	*****/ 50	ale ale ale ale	F 00	4 40	4 00	
	Did field experience contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.20	****
	Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 48		5.00	4.40	4.11	****
	Was the instructor available for consultation	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.71	****
	To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	3.00	****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.72	
5.	Did conferences help you carry out field activities	12	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00
	Self Paced														
1.	Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.44	****
	Did study questions make clear the expected goal	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.71	****
3.	Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	4.68	****
	Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	15	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	4.65	****
5.	Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI

Enrollment: 26
Questionnaires: 16

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1496 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

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

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: OSKOZ, ANA

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1497 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Question	S		NR	NA	Fre	-	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean	UMBC Mean	Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did	vou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	5	4	8	4 18	1035/1576	4.23	4.34	4.30	4.11	4.18
		ctor make clear			1	0	0	1	4	4	7		1100/1576		4.32	4.27	4.18	4.06
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	8	8	4.41	696/1342		4.48	4.32	4.19	4.41
		uations reflect			0	0	0	1	2	5	9	4.29	815/1520	4.27	4.30	4.25	4.09	4.29
				what you learned	0	0	0	4	3	3	7	3.76	1095/1465	3.81	4.26	4.12	4.02	3.76
				o what you learned	0	1	0	1	4	3	8	4.13	816/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	4.13
7. Was	the grading	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	2	2	7	6	4.00	1041/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	4.00
8. How	many times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	1	0	2	14	4.71	851/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.71
9. How	would you	grade the overa	ll teac	hing effectiveness	3	0	0	0	2	9	3	4.07	886/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.07
		Lectur	е															
1. Were	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well	prepared	0	0	0	0	4	4	9	4.29	1079/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	4.29
2. Did	the instru	ctor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	0	0	0	0	3	2	12	4.53	1193/1493	4.73	4.78	4.73	4.65	4.53
3. Was	lecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	1	0	4	2	10	4.18	1017/1486	4.25	4.33	4.32	4.26	4.18
		es contribute t		-	0	0	0	0	4	3	10	4.35	867/1489	4.41	4.40	4.32	4.22	4.35
5. Did	audiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	0	1	1	0	4	4	7	4.00	692/1277	3.97	3.99	4.03	3.91	4.00
		Discus	sion															
1. Did	class disc	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	9	0	0	0	0	5	3	4.38	575/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.38
				d to participate	9	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	412/1270	4.54	4.57	4.35	4.09	4.75
				d open discussion	9	0	0	0	1	4	3	4.25	819/1269	4.44	4.38	4.35	4.09	4.25
4. Were	e special to	echniques succe	ssful	-	10	0	0	0	0	4	3	4.43	270/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.43
		Labora	tory															
2. Were	you provi	ded with adequa	te back	ground information	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.29	****
3. Were	e necessary	materials avai	lable f	or lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.43	****
				Frequ	iency	/ Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits	s Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	\$			Туј	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 0		Red	 guire	ed fo	or Ma	ior	 s	9	Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 5						J	-	-			-) 0		-
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C 10		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	.7	Non-	major	17
84-150) 1	3.00-3.49	1	D 0													-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				1	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enoug	jh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ner					6						

1

Title ELEMENTARY SPANISH II

Instructor: COYNE, MARIA

Enrollment: 28
Questionnaires: 25

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1498 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

						Fre	eque:	ncie	S		Ins	tructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Questions		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 General															
1 Did v	ou dain ne		s from this course	1	0	1	1	4	8	10	4 04	1124/1576	4.23	4 34	4.30	4.11	4.04
			he expected goals	1	0	0	3	4	5	12		1088/1576			4.27	4.18	4.08
			the expected goals	1	0	0	1	0	9			583/1342		4.48			4.50
			he expected goals	1	3	0	0	2	8	11		648/1520		4.30	4.25		4.43
			e to what you learned	1	3	0	3	5	4	9		989/1465		4.26	4.12	4.02	3.90
			ute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	4	12	6	3.88	1021/1434	3.96	4.22	4.14	3.94	3.88
7. Was tl	he grading	system clearly	explained	1	0	1	3	6	5	9	3.75	1239/1547	4.12	4.12	4.19	4.10	3.75
8. How ma	any times	was class cancel	led	2	1	0	0	0	17	5	4.23	1346/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.59	4.23
9. How wo	ould you g	grade the overall	teaching effectiveness	8	0	1	0	3	4	9	4.18	794/1554	4.15	4.13	4.10	4.01	4.18
		Lecture															
1. Were	the instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	2	0	1	3	2	8	9	3.91	1307/1488	4.26	4.39	4.47	4.41	3.91
			ted in the subject	2	0	0	1	0				947/1493		4.78	4.73		4.74
			and explained clearly	2	0	1	1	3	10			1101/1486		4.33			4.00
		es contribute to		2	0	1	1	4	7			1096/1489		4.40	4.32	4.22	4.04
			nce your understanding	3	2	3	3	2	4	8		997/1277		3.99	4.03	3.91	3.55
		-	1														
		Discussi															
			e to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	3		4.58	393/1279	4.36	4.30	4.17	3.96	4.58
			uraged to participate	13	0	0	0	2	1	9	4.58			4.57	4.35		4.58
			ir and open discussion	13	0	0	0	0			4.92				4.35	4.09	
4. Were	special te	chniques success	ful	13	1	0	0	2	3	6	4.36	305/ 878	4.32	4.19	4.05	3.91	4.36
		Seminar															
5. Were	criteria f	for grading made	clear	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00
		Field Wo	rk														
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carry	out field activities	0	1	0	0	0	0	24	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00
		Self Pa	and														
5. Were	there enou		all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00
			P		- D-1	1											
			Frequ	lency	DIS	trib	utio	n									
Credits 1	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re	ason	s			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0 A 6		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	 е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	1		0 B 13			-			-						J -		
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1 C 1		Ger	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	15	Non-	-major	25
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	5 D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					ſh
			P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	nt	
			Ι 0		Ot1	her					8						
			? 1														

Course-Section: SPAN 103 0201 Title

INT REV ELEM SPANISH

Instructor: COYNE, MARIA

Enrollment: 23 Questionnaires: 19 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1499 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	3		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
2. Did the 3. Did the 4. Did othe 5. Did assi 6. Did writ	instruct exam que r evalua gned rea ten assi		lls fro the ex t the ex the ex ute to ibute t	pected goals expected goals epected goals what you learned o what you learned	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 0 2 0	0 0 0 0 0 1 0 3	1 1 1 3 2 1	0 3 1 0 2 2 4	9 5 2 6 5 3	9 10 15 10 7 11 8	4.37	829/1576 929/1576 443/1342 902/1520 1004/1465 564/1434 1289/1547	4.37 4.26 4.63 4.21 3.88 4.37 3.63	4.34 4.32 4.48 4.30 4.26 4.22 4.12	4.30 4.27 4.32 4.25 4.12 4.14 4.19	4.11 4.18 4.19 4.09 4.02 3.94 4.10	4.37 4.26 4.63 4.21 3.88 4.37 3.63
_		vas class cance		hing effectiveness	1 2	0	0	0 1	2	9 7	7 7	4.28 4.18	1309/1574 794/1554	4.28 4.18	4.55 4.13	4.64 4.10	4.59 4.01	4.28
1. Were the 2. Did the 3. Was lect 4. Did the	instruct instruct ure mate lectures	Lecture ctor's lecture cor seem inter crial presente contribute to	e s well ested i d and e o what	prepared n the subject explained clearly	2 1 1 1	0 0 0 0 7	0 0 0 0 3	1 0 1 1	3 1 1 2 5	4 2 5 2 0	9 15 11 13 2	4.24 4.78 4.44 4.50	1126/1488 868/1493 763/1486 696/1489 1210/1277	4.24 4.78 4.44 4.50 2.73	4.39 4.78 4.33 4.40 3.99	4.47 4.73 4.32 4.32 4.03	4.41 4.65 4.26 4.22 3.91	4.24 4.78 4.44 4.50
 Were all Did the 	student instruct	s actively en	ute to courage fair ar	what you learned d to participate d open discussion	12 12 12 12	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 2	3 0 2 2	4 7 5 3	4.57 5.00 4.71 4.14	400/1279 1/1270 491/1269 425/ 878	4.57 5.00 4.71 4.14	4.30 4.57 4.38 4.19	4.17 4.35 4.35 4.05	3.96 4.09 4.09 3.91	4.57 5.00 4.71 4.14
5. Were cri	teria fo	Semina or grading made			0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	3.78	5.00
5. Did conf	erences		y out f	ield activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	3.64	5.00
5. Were the	re enoug	Self : gh proctors fo			0	0	0	0	0	0	19	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	3.86	5.00
				Frequ	.ency	Dist	rib	utior	1									
Credits Ear	ned 	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Тур	oe 			Majors	
00-27 28-55 56-83 84-150	0 2 3	0.00-0.99 1.00-1.99 2.00-2.99 3.00-3.49	0 0 1 4	A 12 B 5 C 1 D 0			quire neral		or Ma	jor		3 2	Graduate Under-gi		0	Majo Non-	or -major	0 19
64-150 Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	6	F 0 P 0 I 0 ? 0		Ele Otl	ectiv ner	ves				3	#### - N response					h

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: AREVALO-GUERRER

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 17

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1500 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		Questions		NR	NA	Fro	eque:	ncie 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		General															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights, skills fro	om this course	0	0	0	0	2	6	9	4.41	772/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.41
		ctor make clear the ex		0	0	0	0	1	4	12	4.65	420/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.65
		uestions reflect the e	-	0	0	0	0	2	3	12	4.59	500/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.59
4. Did ot	ther eval	uations reflect the ex	spected goals	0	1	0	0	1	6	9	4.50	511/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.50
5. Did as	ssigned r	eadings contribute to	what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	4.29	606/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.29
		signments contribute t		0	0	0	0	1	5	11	4.59	338/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.59
	-	g system clearly expla	ained	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	4.41	673/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.41
		was class cancelled		0	0	0	0	0	10	7		1189/1574		4.55	4.64	4.62	4.41
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overall tead	ching effectiveness	1	0	1	0	0	7	8	4.31	649/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.31
		Lecture															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lectures well	prepared	0	0	0	0	0	1	16	4.94	149/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.94
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem interested i	in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	15	4.88	607/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.88
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presented and e	explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	3	13	4.71	407/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.71
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute to what	you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	14	4.76	364/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.76
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques enhance y	our understanding	0	3	0	0	3	5	6	4.21	569/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.21
		Discussion															
1. Did cl	lass disc	ussions contribute to	what you learned	6	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	358/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.64
2. Were a	all stude	nts actively encourage	ed to participate	6	0	0	0	0	2	9	4.82	345/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.82
3. Did th	ne instru	ctor encourage fair ar	nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	278/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.91
4. Were s	special t	echniques successful		6	2	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	204/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.56
		Laboratory															
1. Did th	ne lab in	crease understanding o	of the material	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 234	***	5.00	4.23	4.44	****
		ded with adequate back		16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were r	necessary	materials available f	or lab activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.65	****
		structor provide assis		16	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 232		5.00	4.29	4.38	****
5. Were n	requireme	nts for lab reports cl	learly specified	16	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.29	****
		Seminar															
5. Were	criteria	for grading made clear	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00
		Field Work															
5. Did co	onference	s help you carry out f	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
		Self Paced															
5. Were t	there eno	ugh proctors for all t	the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00
			Frequ	iencv	Dis	trib	utio	n									
			-	1													
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Re 	ason	s 			Ту	pe 			Majors 	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99 1	A 4		Re	quir	ed f	or M	ajor	s	8	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99 0	В 11				_										
56-83	1_	2.00-2.99 2	C 1		Ge	nera	1				1	Under-g	rad 1	L7	Non-	-major	16
84-150	7	3.00-3.49 2	D 0								•			,			
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00 5	F 0		El	ecti [.]	ves				2	#### -				_	ın
			Р 0 т 0		O+-	h a					6	respons	es to r	e sigi	ıııcar	IL	
			I 0		Ot.	her					6						

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

AREVALO-GUERRER

Instructor:

Enrollment: 21 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1501 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

		Questions		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	5 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank		Dept Mean		Level Mean	
1 541		General	1 - Farm +1-1	0	0	0	0	0	_	0	4 57	E 41 /1 E 5 C	4 24	4 24	4 20	4 25	4 57
			ls from this course the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0 1	6	8 11	4.57 4.71		4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.57 4.71
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	12	4.71	263/1342	4.49	4.48	4.27	4.41	4.71
			the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3		4.64		4.43	4.30	4.25		4.79
			te to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	6		4.21	,	3.99		4.12		4.21
			bute to what you learned		0	0	0	2	3	9		398/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14		4.50
		system clearly		0	0	0	0	2	4	8		657/1547		4.12	4.19		4.43
		was class cance		0	0	0	0	0	7	7		1079/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64		4.50
			l teaching effectiveness		0	0	0	0	2	5		222/1554			4.10	4.05	
		Lecture															
1. Were t	he instru	ctor's lectures	well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	198/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.92
2. Did th	ne instruc	tor seem intere	sted in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	445/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.93
			and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	4.93	137/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.93
			what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	4.79	336/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.79
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	ance your understanding	1	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	489/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.31
		Discuss															
			te to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	1		4.88	184/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	
			ouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	,	4.64		4.35		4.88
			air and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	310/1269		4.38			4.88
4. Were s	special te	chniques succes	sful	6	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.88
		Seminar															
5. Were d	riteria f	or grading made	clear	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00
		Field W	ork														
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
		Self P	aced														
5. Were t	here enou	igh proctors for	all the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00
			Freq	uency	/ Dist	trib	ution	1									
Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3			Туј	ne			Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0 A 3		Red	quir	ed fo	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.0	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0 B 6		~		,				0	1	, ,				1.0
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3 C 5		Gei	nera	Τ				0	Under-g	rad 1	L 4	Non-	-major	13
84-150	6	3.00-3.49	3 D 0								0			.1			.1-
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3 F 0		Εl	ecti	ves				0	#### - I				_	ın
		P 0									response	es to b	be sign	ııııcar	ıĊ		

Other

4

I

?

0

0

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI

Enrollment: 23
Questionnaires: 22

22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1502 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		Question	5		NR	NA	Fr 1	_	ncies 3	4	5	Ins Mean	tructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
		Genera	 1															
1. Did v	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	1	2	6	6	7	3.73	1357/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	3.73
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	6	3	9	3	3.32	1470/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	3.32
3. Did t	he exam qu	uestions reflect	t the e	expected goals	0	0	3	4	2	6	7	3.45	1229/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	3.45
4. Did o	ther evalu	uations reflect	the ex	spected goals	0	0	4	0	5	8	5	3.45	1381/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	3.45
				what you learned	0	4	2	2	6	7	1	3.17	1355/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.17
				o what you learned	0	1	2	5	3	8	3		1317/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	3.24
	-	g system clearly		ined	0	0	4	0	9	6	3		1427/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	3.18
		was class cance			1	0	0	0	0	1	20		235/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.95
9. How w	ould you	grade the overa.	ll teac	ching effectiveness	6	0	1	1	8	3	3	3.38	1357/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.38
		Lecture	е															
		uctor's lectures			3	0	1	3	6	7	2	3.32	1422/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.32
		ctor seem inter		_	3	0	0	0	1	5	13	4.63	1089/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.63
		-		explained clearly	3	0	4	3	5	4	3		1434/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	2.95
		es contribute to			3	0	3	3	5	3	5		1389/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	
5. Did a	udiovisua	l techniques enl	nance y	our understanding	3	6	4	3	2	3	1	2.54	1235/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	2.54
		Discus	sion															
1. Did c	class discu	ussions contrib	ute to	what you learned	11	0	2	1	4	2	2	3.09	1174/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	3.09
2. Were	all studer	nts actively end	courage	ed to participate	11	0	0	2	2	5	2	3.64	1103/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	3.64
				nd open discussion	11	0	0	2	3	2	4	3.73	1047/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	3.73
4. Were	special te	echniques succes	ssful		11	1	3	1	2	3	1	2.80	837/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	2.80
		Semina	r															
5. Were	criteria i	for grading made	e clear		17	0	0	0	0	0	5	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	****
		Field V	Work															
5. Did c	conferences			ield activities	21	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	****
		Self 1	Dogod															
5. Were	there enou	agh proctors for		he students	15	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00
				_														
				Frequ	ıency	7 Dis	trıb	ut10	n									
Credits	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	\$			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 A 5		Re	auir	ed f	or Ma	ior	 s 1	2	 Graduat	 e	0	Majo	 or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 7		100	-1~++	- L	110		- 1	_	52 44440	-	-	. 10.) (0
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	3	C 5		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	-major	22
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0									5				-	
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0		El	ecti	ves				1	#### -	Means t	here a	are not	enoug	ſh
				P 0									respons	es to b	e sign	nificar	nt	
				I 0		Ot:	her					5						
				? 0														

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU

Enrollment: 24
Questionnaires: 18

24

Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1503 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Questions	5		NR	NA	Fre	_	ncies 3	s 4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			Genera	 ı															
1 D	id vou	aain ne	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	1	0	4	13	4.61	485/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.61
			ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	0	17	4.89	166/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.89
			estions reflect			0	0	0	0	1	1		4.83	221/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.83
			ations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	228/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.78
					what you learned	0	3	0	0	5	2	8	4.20	708/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.20
					to what you learned	0	1	0	0	1	7	9	4.47	435/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.47
7. Wa	as the	grading	system clearly	expla	ained -	0	0	0	0	0	2	16	4.89	135/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.89
8. H	ow man	y times	was class cance	elled		1	0	0	0	0	15	2	4.12	1417/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.12
9. H	ow wou	ld you g	grade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	3	0	0	1	0	4	10	4.53	371/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.53
			Lecture	3															
			actor's lectures			0	0	0	0	0	3	15	4.83	355/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.83
			ctor seem inter			0	0	0	0	0			4.94	,	4.90	4.78	4.73		4.94
					explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.78	311/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32		4.78
			es contribute to			0	0	0	0	1	3		4.72	420/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	
5. D	id aud	iovisual	techniques enl	nance :	your understanding	1	2	2	1	3	3	6	3.67	943/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.67
			Discus																
					what you learned	8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	312/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17		4.70
					ed to participate	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	355/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.80
					nd open discussion	8	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	386/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.80
4. W	ere sp	ecial te	echniques succes	ssiul		8	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	152/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.70
			Semina					•	•		•			4 / 055		4 05	4 0 0	4 01	
5. W	ere cr	iteria i	for grading made	e clea:	r	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00
		_	Field V					•	•		•					4 00	4 00	4 40	
5. D	id con	ierences	s help you carry	out :	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
E 17			Self 1			0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	F 00	1 / 200	F 00	4 00	4 00	4 20	F 00
5. W	ere un	ere enou	igh proctors fo	all	the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	5.00
					Frequ	lency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Cred	its Ea	rned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	S			Туј	pe			Majors	}
00-	 27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Re	quir	ed f	or Ma	ajor	s 1	.3	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0
28-	55	0	1.00-1.99	0	в 7														
56-	83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 1		Ge	nera	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	.8	Non-	-major	18
84-	150	7	3.00-3.49	6	D 0														
Grad	d.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		El	ecti	ves				0	#### - I				_	ſh
					P 0									response	es to b	e sign	nifican	ıt	
					I 0		Ot!	her					3						
					? 0														

Course-Section: SPAN 201 0801 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1504 JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI

4. Were special techniques successful

Enrollment: 27 Ouestionnaires: 18

Student Course Evaluation Ouestionnaire

Frequencies Instructor Course Dept UMBC Level Sect Ouestions NR NA 1 2 3 4 5 Mean Rank Mean Mean Mean Mean 1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course 0 0 0 0 6 4.17 1042/1576 4.34 4.34 4.30 4.35 4.17 2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 1 0 0 0 3 8 6 4.18 1014/1576 4.48 4.32 4.27 4.32 4.18 3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 1 5 12 4.61 467/1342 4.49 4.48 4.32 4.41 4.61 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 0 2 10 6 4.22 891/1520 4.43 4.30 4.25 4.26 4.22 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 1 5 7 3 3.75 1102/1465 3.99 4.26 4.12 4.09 3.75 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 1 1 0 0 3 9 4 4.06 852/1434 4.21 4.22 4.14 4.06 4.067. Was the grading system clearly explained 1 0 1 2 3 7 4 3.65 1285/1547 4.33 4.12 4.19 4.22 3.65 8. How many times was class cancelled 1 0 0 0 0 2 15 4.88 508/1574 4.60 4.55 4.64 4.62 4.88 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 4 0 0 1 4 5 4 3.86 1096/1554 4.31 4.13 4.10 4.05 3.86 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 0 4 6 6 4.13 1192/1488 4.55 4.39 4.47 4.44 4.13 2 0 0 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 0 0 1 15 4.94 390/1493 4.90 4.78 4.73 4.75 4.94 2 0 0 0 3 5 8 4.31 911/1486 4.44 4.33 4.32 4.29 4.31 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2 3 10 4.38 845/1489 4.48 4.40 4.32 4.31 4.38 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 6 1 2 1 4 2 3.40 1066/1277 3.85 3.99 4.03 4.01 3.40 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 2 4 4.14 745/1279 4.40 4.30 4.17 4.14 4.14 3 4 4.57 582/1270 4.64 4.57 4.35 4.30 4.57 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 11 0 0 0 0 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 11 0

11 2 0 Frequency Distribution

0

0 0 5 2 4.29 803/1269 4.61 4.38 4.35 4.29 4.29

0 0 2 3 4.60 187/ 878 4.44 4.19 4.05 3.92 4.60

Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	14	Graduate	0	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	7						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	5	C	5	General	0	Under-grad	18	Non-major	18
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	4	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	1	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	nificant	
				I	0	Other	3	-			
				?	1						

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Instructor: SHORKEY, CATALI

Enrollment: 25 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1505 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

							Fre	equei	ncies	;		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
		Question	3		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1 Did vo	ou dain ne	Genera w insights,ski		m this course	0	0	0	0	3	4	7	4.29	916/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.29
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	5	a a		420/1576		4.32	4.27	4.32	
		estions reflec			0	0	0	0	0	8	6	4.43			4.48		4.41	
		ations reflect			0	0	0	1	0	6	7		744/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.36
				what you learned	0	0	2	0	2	6			1130/1465		4.26	4.12	4.09	3.71
				to what you learned	0	2	0	2	1	2	7		777/1434		4.22	4.14	4.06	4.17
		g system clearly			0	0	0	1	0			4.57			4.12	4.19		4.57
	-	was class cance	-	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0	0	0	0	0	4		4.71	-, -		4.55	4.64	4.62	
				hing effectiveness	4	0	0	0	0	4			316/1554					
		,											,					
		Lecture																
		actor's lecture			1	0	0	0	0	5	8	4.62	736/1488		4.39	4.47	4.44	4.62
		ctor seem inter			1	0	0	0	0	2			708/1493		4.78	4.73		4.85
				explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	5		4.46	735/1486	4.44	4.33			4.46
		es contribute to		-	1	0	0	1	0	4	8	4.46	742/1489		4.40		4.31	
5. Did au	ıdiovisual	l techniques en	nance y	our understanding	1	1	3	0	1	3	5	3.58	983/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.58
		Discus	ni on															
1 Did cl	lagg digo			what you learned	5	0	0	1	2	2	4	4.00	802/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4 00
				ed to participate	5	0	0	0	1	3		4.44			4.57	4.35		4.44
				nd open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	1		4.63			4.38		4.29	
		echniques succe		a open arboabbien	6	0	0	0	1	1	-		179/ 878				3.92	
		1											, .					
		Semina																
5. Were c	criteria f	for grading made	e clear	•	10	0	0	0	0	0	4	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	5.00
		Field '	Vork															
5. Did co	onferences	s help you carr	out f	field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	****
E Mara +	-howe ones	Self : agh proctors fo		ho atudonta	10	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/ 382	E 00	4 00	4 00	4 20	5.00
5. Were t	THELE EHOU	igii proctors ro.	L all (lie students	10	U	U	U	U	U	4	5.00	1/ 302	5.00	4.99	4.00	4.39	5.00
				Frequ	ency	Dist	tribu	utio	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons				Ty	ne			Majors	ı.
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 4		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.2	Graduat	е	0	Majo	or	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 6														
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C 4		Ger	nera:	1				0	Under-g	rad 1	. 4	Non-	-major	14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	5	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	3	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				0	#### - 1					ıh
				P 0								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ificar	ıt	
				I O		Otł	ner					1						
				? 0														

Course-Section: SPAN 201 1001 Universit
Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltim

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH Instructor: COLOMBO, LAURA

Enrollment: 19
Questionnaires: 15

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1506 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	500/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.60
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	301/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.73
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	5	9	4.53	552/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.53
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	7	8	4.53	476/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.53
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	2	0	0	2	3	7	4.42	498/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.42
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	7	7	4.50	398/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	0	2	4	8	4.43	657/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.43
8. How many times was class cancelled	2	0	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	739/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.77
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	6	6	4.38	558/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.38
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	624/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	445/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.92
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	2	0	0	0	0	4	9	4.69	422/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.69
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	155/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.92
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	1	4	7	4.50	309/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.50
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	6	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	5.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	299/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.89
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	0	1	7	4.88	119/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.88

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	4	Required for Majors	8	Graduate	1	Major	0
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	4						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	2	C	4	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	15
84-150	2	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	3	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	6				
				?	0						

Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

COLOMBO, LAURA

Instructor:

Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 14

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1507 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student	Course	${\tt Evaluation}$	Questionnaire
---------	--------	--------------------	---------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean			
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	2	0	2	1	9		1106/1576		4.34	4.30	4.35	4.07
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	1	2	10	4.50	608/1576	4.48	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.50
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	3	10	4.64	430/1342	4.49	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.64
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	3	10	4.77	239/1520	4.43	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.77
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	2	1	1	1	8	3.92	961/1465	3.99	4.26	4.12	4.09	3.92
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	4	1	8	4.07	848/1434	4.21	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.07
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	1	0	1	12	4.71	280/1547	4.33	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.71
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	832/1574	4.60	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.71
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	1	1	0	3	7	4.17	805/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.69	624/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.69
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	13	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	1	2	1	9	4.38	841/1486	4.44	4.78	4.73	4.75	4.38
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	1	1	0	10	4.30	921/1489	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	2	1	0	1	1	2	7	4.31	438/1277		3.99	4.32	4.01	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	4	1	U	Т	1	2	,	4.30	430/12//	3.05	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.30
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	1	2	6	4.56	413/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	4.56
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	279/1270	4.64	4.57	4.35	4.30	4.89
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	5	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	421/1269	4.61	4.38	4.35	4.29	4.78
4. Were special techniques successful	5	0	0	0	1	3	5	4.44	258/ 878	4.44	4.19	4.05	3.92	4.44
T all according to														
Laboratory	1.0	•	•	•	•	_	-	- 00		ale ale ale ale	F 00	4 25	4 45	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	13	0	0	0	0	0	1		****/ 240	***	5.00	4.35	4.47	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.65	****
Seminar														
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.83	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.80	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	12	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	****
Field Work														
	1.0	0	^	^	0	^	1	F 00	++++/ 20C	F 00	4 00	4 02	4 42	
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	13	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	^ ^ ^ ^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	5.00	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	13	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	5.00	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	13	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	12	1	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	****

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	2	0.00-0.99	0	 А	2	Required for Majors	6	Graduate	0	Major	1
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	2	C	3	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	13
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	n
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	7	-			
				2	1						

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I

Title Instructor: STRICKLING, LAU

Enrollment: 30 Questionnaires: 22 Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1508 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

		0			, TD	373		equer			_		ructor		_		Level	
		Questions 	; 		NR 	NA	1		3	4 	5	Mean	Rank 	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	mean
		General																
_	_	v insights,skil			1	0	0	0	0	8	13	4.62	485/1576	4.34	4.34	4.30	4.35	4.62
		or make clear	_	_	1	0	0	0	1	5	15	4.67	392/1576		4.32	4.27	4.32	4.67
	_	estions reflect	_	-	1	0	0	0	3			4.52	, -		4.48			4.52
		ations reflect			1	0	1	0	0			4.57				4.25		4.57
		adings contribu		_	1	2	0	2	1			4.26				4.12	4.09	4.26
				what you learned	2	0	0	1	3			4.30			4.22	4.14	4.06	4.30
		system clearly		ed	1	0	0	0	2				280/1547		4.12	4.19	4.22	
	_	vas class cance			1	0	0	0	0	14			1262/1574		4.55	4.64	4.62	
9. How wo	uld you gr	rade the overal	.l teachi	ng effectiveness	6	1	0	0	0	2	13	4.87	133/1554	4.31	4.13	4.10	4.05	4.87
		Lecture	<u>:</u>															
1. Were t	he instruc	ctor's lectures	well pre	epared	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	463/1488	4.55	4.39	4.47	4.44	4.78
2. Did the	e instruct	or seem intere	sted in t	the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1493	4.90	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was le	cture mate	erial presented	l and exp	lained clearly	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	325/1486	4.44	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.76
4. Did th	e lectures	s contribute to	what you	ı learned	4	0	0	0	0	4	14	4.78	350/1489	4.48	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.78
5. Did au	diovisual	techniques enh	ance your	r understanding	4	1	0	1	4	5	7	4.06	672/1277	3.85	3.99	4.03	4.01	4.06
		Discuss																
1 Did al	and diagna	Discuss ssions contribu		at rrow loowned	12	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	381/1279	4.40	4.30	4.17	4.14	1 60
		ssions contributes actively end		-	12	0	0	0	0	2			355/1270		4.57	4.17		4.80
			open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	2		4.60			4.38		4.29		
		chniques succes	open discussion	12	0	0	0	1	3			221/ 878						
1. WELE B	peciai ecc	Initques succes		12	U	O	O	_	5	Ü	1.50	221/ 0/0		1.10	1.05	3.72	1.50	
		Seminar																
5. Were c	riteria fo	or grading made	clear		20	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.21	***
		Field W	lork															
5. Did co	nferences	help you carry	out fie	ld activities	16	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.43	5.00
F Ware +	h	Self F ah proctors for			17	0	0	0	0	0	_	г оо	****/ 382		4 00	4 00	4 20	++++
5. were t	nere enoug	n proctors for	all the	students	Ι/	U	U	U	U	U	5	5.00	^^^/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.39	
				Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	utior	ı									
G		G GD3		The second of th				D									36-4	
Credits E	arnea 	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades					sons					pe 			Majors		
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	A 12		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	jor	s 1	.6	Graduat	e	0	Majo	or	0	
28-55	2	1.00-1.99	0	в 6														
56-83	5	2.00-2.99	3	C 1		Ger	neral	L				0	Under-g	rad 2	22	Non-	major	22
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	4	D 0														
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	#### -				_	h	
				P 0									respons	es to k	oe sign	ifican	ıt	
				I 0		Oth	ıer					2						
				? 0														

Course-Section: SPAN 202 0201 University of Maryland Title INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County

INTERMEDIATE SPANISH I Baltimore County
MESSICK, ROSALI Spring 2009

Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI

Enrollment: 18
Questionnaires: 13

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1509 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

		0	_		MD	3.7.7	Fre	_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_			Sect
		Question	S 		NK	NA			3	4		Mean	Rank	mean	mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain ne	ew insights,ski	_	n this course	0	0	2	2	6	2	1	2.85	1554/1576	2.85	4.34	4.30	4.35	2.85
		ctor make clear			0	0	1	5	3	3	1		1548/1576		4.32	4.27	4.32	2.85
		uestions reflec			0	9	0	0	2	0	2		972/1342		4.48	4.32	4.41	4.00
		uations reflect			0	1	1	1		5	4		1212/1520			4.25	4.26	3.83
				what you learned	0	4	2		3	2			1418/1465		4.26	4.12	4.09	2.89
	_	_		what you learned	0	0	0						1087/1434		4.22	4.14	4.06	3.77
		g system clearl		-	0	2	5	2	2	1	1	2.18	1534/1547	2.18	4.12	4.19	4.22	2.18
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	1	12	4.92	375/1574	4.92	4.55	4.64	4.62	4.92
9. How wo	ould you	grade the overa	ll teac	ning effectiveness	4	1	1	0	3	3	1	3.38	1357/1554	3.38	4.13	4.10	4.05	3.38
				_														
		Lectur	е															
1. Were t	the instr	uctor's lecture	s well]	prepared	4	0	1	2	1	5	0	3.11	1445/1488	3.11	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.11
2. Did th	ne instru	ctor seem inter	ested in	n the subject	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was $1e$	ecture mat	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	4	0	1	1	4			3.00	1421/1486	3.00	4.33	4.32	4.29	3.00
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	4	0	0	2		3		3.56	1305/1489	3.56	4.40	4.32	4.31	3.56
5. Did au	udiovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	3	1	1	0	3	3	2	3.56	997/1277	3.56	3.99	4.03	4.01	3.56
		Discus																
				what you learned	10		0	0	0	0	3		****/1279	****	1.00	4.17	4.14	****
				d to participate	11	0	0	0	0	0	2		****/1270	****	4.57	4.35	4.30	****
				d open discussion	11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/1269	****	4.38	4.35	4.29	****
4. Were s	special to	echniques succe	ssful		11	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	****/ 878	****	4.19	4.05	3.92	****
				Frequ	lency	r Dist	tribu	utio	1									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	;
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A 9		Rec	 miir		 or Ma	ior		1	Graduat	 _	0	Majo	 r	1
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	B 1		1000	2411	-u I	J_ 1-1C		_	_	Gradat	_		1.10.10	<i>,</i> _	_	
56-83	4	2.00-2.99	0 0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				2	Under-q	rad 1	.3	Non-	-major	12
84-150	1	3.00-3.49	4	D 0		001		_				_	011001 9		-	2.011		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F 0		Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				3	#### - 1	Means t	here a	are not	enous	rh
0100.	ŭ	2.23 1.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Oth	her					5		~			-	
				? 1								-						
				• =														

Course-Section: SPAN 202H 0101 University of Maryland Page 1510 Baltimore County JUL 2, 2009 INTERMED SPAN II HONR Job IRBR3029

Title Instructor: MESSICK, ROSALI Spring 2009

Enrollment:	1		
Questionnaires:	1	Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire	

			Fre	eque	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1576	5.00	4.34	4.30	4.35	5.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1138/1576	4.00	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342	4.00	4.48	4.32	4.41	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1520	4.00	4.30	4.25	4.26	4.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.22	4.14	4.06	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1041/1547	4.00	4.12	4.19	4.22	4.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.62	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1554	5.00	4.13	4.10	4.05	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1452/1488	3.00	4.39	4.47	4.44	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.75	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.29	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.31	4.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1277	5.00	3.99	4.03	4.01	5.00
_		-· ·	,											

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l 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	В	0						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	0	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	1	Non-major	1
84-150	0	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 sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	0				
				?	0						

ADVANCED SPANISH I

Title Instructor: NASH, LYLE

Enrollment: 15 Questionnaires: 11

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1511 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

			Question	s		NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	Dept Mean		Level Mean	Sect Mean
			Genera	 1															
1. I	oid you	ı gain ne	w insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	1	3	7	4.55	582/1576	3.94	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.55
			tor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	4	6	4.45	683/1576	3.89	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.45
			estions reflec			1	0	0	0	0	5	5	4.50	583/1342	4.14	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.50
4. I	oid oth	ner evalu	ations reflect	the ex	xpected goals	1	1	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	339/1520	4.17	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.67
5. I	oid ass	signed re	adings contrib	ute to	what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	122/1465	4.79	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.91
6. I	Did wri	tten ass	ignments contr	ibute t	to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	4.64	296/1434	4.37	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.64
7. V	Was the	grading	system clearl	y expla	ained	0	0	1	1	1	3	5	3.91	1145/1547	3.51	4.12	4.19	4.21	3.91
8. I	How mar	y times	was class canc	elled		1	0	0	0	0	1	9	4.90	469/1574	4.06	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.90
9. I	How wou	ild you g	rade the overa	ll tead	ching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	0	5	1	3.71	1194/1554	3.44	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.71
			Lectur	e															
			ctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	2	1	7	4.50	870/1488	3.92	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.50
2. I	Did the	instruc	tor seem inter	ested :	in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	4.89	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00
					explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	561/1486	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.60
4. I	Did the	e lecture	s contribute t	o what	you learned	1	0	0	0	1	1	8	4.70	461/1489	4.18	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.70
5. I	Did aud	liovisual	techniques en	hance y	your understanding	1	0	0	0	4	2	4	4.00	692/1277	4.33	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.00
			Discus	sion															
1. I	Did cla	ss discu	ssions contrib	ute to	what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1279	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.20	5.00
2. V	Were al	l studen	ts actively en	ed to participate	5	0	0	0	0	1	5	4.83	326/1270	4.75	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.83	
3. I	Did the	e instruc	tor encourage	nd open discussion	5	0	0	0	1	0	5	4.67	535/1269	4.58	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.67	
4. V	Were sp	ecial te	chniques succe	ssful		5	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	164/ 878	4.58	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.67
			Semina	r															
5. V	Were cr	riteria f	or grading mad	e clear	<u> </u>	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 375	5.00	4.97	4.01	4.12	5.00
			Field	Work															
5. I	Did cor	ferences	help you carr	y out i	field activities	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 326	5.00	4.99	4.03	4.23	5.00
			Self	Paced															
5. V	Were th	nere enou	gh proctors for	r all t	the students	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	5.00	1/ 382	5.00	4.99	4.08	4.24	5.00
					Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Cred	dits Ea	ırned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			Ту	oe			Majors	}
	-27	3	0.00-0.99	0	A 7		Red	quire	ed fo	or Ma	ijor	s	0	Graduat	9	0	Majo	r	4
	-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В 2									_					
	-83	2	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	L				0	Under-g	rad 1	1	Non-	major	7
	-150	2	3.00-3.49	1	D 0								_						
Gra	ad.	0	3.50-4.00	5	F 0		Ele	ecti	ves				1	#### - 1					ŗh
					P 1								_	respons	es to b	e sign	ifican	ıt	
					I 0		Oth	ner					9						
					? 0														

University of Maryland Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT Enrollment:

Title

Course-Section: SPAN 301 0201

ADVANCED SPANISH I

14 Questionnaires: 10

Page 1512 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

	Evaluation	

			Fre	equei	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	1	1	1	6	0	3.33	1494/1576	3.94	4.34	4.30	4.30	3.33
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	1	0	3	5	0	3.33	1463/1576	3.89	4.32	4.27	4.28	3.33
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	1	5	2	3.78	1123/1342	4.14	4.48	4.32	4.30	3.78
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	1	0	2	4	2	3.67	1300/1520	4.17	4.30	4.25	4.25	3.67
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	264/1465	4.79	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.67
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	8	1	4.11	826/1434	4.37	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.11
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	1	2	1	5	0	3.11	1446/1547	3.51	4.12	4.19	4.21	3.11
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	7	2	0	3.22	1564/1574	4.06	4.55	4.64	4.61	3.22
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	4	0	1	0	2	3	0	3.17	1415/1554	3.44	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.17
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	1	1	1	6	0	3.33	1418/1488	3.92	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	2	7	4.78	868/1493	4.89	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.78
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	1	0	1	5	2		1245/1486	4.19	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.78
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	1	1	7	0		1283/1489	4.18	4.40	4.32	4.34	3.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	215/1277	4.33	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.67
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.50	445/1279	4.75	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	4	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	505/1279	4.75	4.57	4.17	4.42	4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	4	0	0	0	0	2	3	4.50	644/1269	4.75	4.38	4.35	4.42	4.50
4. Were special techniques successful	4	0	0	0	1	1	<i>3</i>	4.50	221/ 878	4.58	4.19	4.35	4.41	4.50
i. Were special techniques successful	7	U	U	U			4	4.50	ZZI/ 0/0	4.50	4.13	4.03	4.03	4.50

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

ADVANCED SPANISH II

Title Instructor: SLOANE, ROBERT

Enrollment: 19 Questionnaires: 12

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

University of Maryland

Baltimore County

Spring 2009

Page 1513 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions								Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	tructor		Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
1. bid you gain new insights,skills from this course 0			Question	s		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Ran	ık	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
1. bid you gain new insights,skills from this course 0			~																	
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals 0 0 1 3 2 5 1 3.17 1503/1576 5.87 4.32 4.77 4.28 3.17 4. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 1 2 2 5 6 4.17 899/1342 4.44 4.48 4.28 4.32 4.30 4.17 4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 0 2 3 5 5 4.00 1041/1520 4.36 4.30 4.25 4.25 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 4 3.92 991/1434 4.07 4.22 4.10 4.15 3.92 71.06 by the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 4 3.92 991/1434 4.07 4.22 4.10 4.15 3.92 71.06 by the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 4 3.92 991/1434 4.07 4.22 4.10 4.15 3.92 71.06 by the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 4 3.92 991/1434 4.07 4.22 4.10 4.15 3.92 71.06 by the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 4 3.92 991/1434 4.07 4.22 4.10 4.15 3.92 71.06 by the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	1 Did 1101	. aain na			m this source	0	0	0	0	Е	2	1	2 02	1001/1	E76	1 20	1 21	4 20	4 20	2 02
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 0 0 0 1 2 3 6 4.17 899/1342 4.44 4.48 4.32 4.30 4.17						-	-	-	-	-		_								
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals 0 1 1 0 0 2 3 5 4.00 104I/1520 4.36 4.30 4.25 4.25 4.00 5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 3 4 5 4.17 738/1465 4.30 4.26 4.12 4.09 4.17 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 3 4 5 9.17 738/1465 4.30 4.26 4.12 4.19 4.21 2.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 4 1 2 2 3 1 1 2.58 1569/1574 3.63 4.12 4.19 4.21 2.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 4 1 2 2 3 1 1 2.58 1569/1574 3.63 4.12 4.19 4.21 2.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 4 1 2 2 3 1 1 2.58 1569/1574 3.65 4.65 4.64 4.61 2.58 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 2 3 3 4 2 3.55 1288/1554 3.77 4.13 4.10 4.09 3.55 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 1 2 2 2 2 3 3 4 0 1406/1488 3.99 4.39 4.47 4.47 3.40 3.40 1. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 810/1493 4.83 4.78 4.73 4.70 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 3 3 3 3 3.70 1273/1486 4.06 4.33 4.32 4.32 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2 5 5 4.01 1065/1489 4.37 4.40 4.32 4.34 4.10 5.00 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 1 5 4 4.30 489/1277 4.15 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.30 Discussion 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 5.00 1/1270 4.62 4.30 4.17 4.20 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5.00 1/1270 4.62 4.30 4.17 4.20 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					1 2	_	-					_								
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 3 4 5 4.17 738/1465 4.30 4.26 4.12 4.09 4.17 6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 3 4 5 4.17 738/1465 4.30 4.26 4.12 4.19 4.15 3.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 4 1 2 4 1 2.75 1500/1547 3.63 4.12 4.19 4.21 2.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 4 2 2 3 4 2 3.55 1288/1554 3.77 4.13 4.10 4.09 3.55 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 4 2 2 3 4 2 3.55 1288/1554 3.77 4.13 4.10 4.09 3.55 8. How many times was class cancelled 2 0 1 2 2 2 3 3 4.0 1406/1488 3.99 4.39 4.47 4.47 3.40 2. Did the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 2 2 2 2 3 3 3.40 1406/1488 3.99 4.39 4.47 4.47 3.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 9 4.80 810/1493 4.83 4.78 4.73 4.70 4.80 3. Mas lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 3 3 3 3.70 1273/1486 4.06 4.33 4.32 4.32 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2 2 5 5 4.10 1065/1489 4.07 4.40 4.32 4.74 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 489/1277 4.15 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.30 8. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 0 1 5 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.30 4.17 4.20 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.34 4.35 4.41 5.00 4.40 2. Were special techniques successful 9 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0									_			-								
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned 0 0 0 0 0 5 3 4 3.92 991/1434 4.07 4.22 4.14 4.15 3.92 7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 0 4 1 2 4 1 2.75 1500/1547 3.63 4.12 4.19 4.21 2.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 4 1 2 2 3 1 2.58 1569/1574 3.63 4.12 4.19 4.21 2.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 0 4 2 2 3 1 2.58 1569/1574 3.45 4.55 4.64 4.61 2.58 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 2 3 4 2 3.55 1288/1554 3.77 4.13 4.10 4.09 3.55 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 2 2 2 3 3.40 1406/1488 3.99 4.39 4.47 4.47 3.40 2. Did the instructor seen interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.88 810/1493 4.83 4.78 4.73 4.70 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 3 3 3 3.70 1273/1486 4.06 4.33 4.32 4.22 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2 2 5 4.10 1055/1489 4.37 4.40 4.32 4.32 3.70 4. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 5 5 6.00 1/1270 4.66 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0								_	-		-	-		- ,						
7. Was the grading system clearly explained 0 0 4 1 2 4 1 2.75 1500/1547 3.63 4.12 4.19 4.21 2.75 8. How many times was class cancelled 0 0 4 2 2 3 1 2.55 1569/1574 3.45 4.55 4.64 4.61 2.58 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 2 3 4 2 3.55 1288/1554 3.77 4.13 4.10 4.09 3.55 Lecture							-	-	-			-								
8. How many times was class cancelled 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. O 0 2 3 3 1 2.58 1569/1574 3.45 4.55 4.64 4.61 2.58 9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1. O 0 2 3 3 4 2 3.55 1288/1554 3.77 4.13 4.10 4.09 3.55 Lecture							-	-	-		-			,						
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness 1 0 0 0 2 3 4 2 3.55 1288/1554 3.77 4.13 4.10 4.09 3.55 Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 0 1 2 2 2 2 3 3.40 1406/1488 3.99 4.39 4.47 4.47 3.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 810/1493 4.83 4.78 4.73 4.70 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 3 3 3 3.70 1273/1486 4.06 4.33 4.32 4.32 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 489/1277 4.15 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.30 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 489/1277 4.15 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.30 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0					illied		-	-			_			,						
Lecture 1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared		-			hing effectiveness						-	_								
1. Mere the instructor's lectures well prepared 2 0 1 1 2 2 2 3 3 .40 1406/1488 3.99 4.39 4.47 4.47 3.40 2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 0 9 4.80 810/1493 4.83 4.78 4.73 4.70 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 3 3 3 3 7.0 1273/1486 4.06 4.33 4.32 4.32 3.70 4.50 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1	J. 110W WOO	iiu you gi	lade the overa	II ceac	iiing effectiveness		U	U	2	J	1	2	3.33	1200/1	. 334	3.77	1.13	4.10	4.00	3.33
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 2 0 0 0 1 1 0 9 4.80 810/1493 4.83 4.78 4.73 4.70 4.80 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 3 3 3 3 3.70 1273/1486 4.06 4.33 4.32 4.32 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2 2 5 4.10 1065/1489 4.37 4.40 4.32 4.34 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 489/1277 4.15 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.30 Discussion Contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 5 4 4.30 489/1277 4.15 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.30 4.00 6. Discussion Contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 554/1279 4.62 4.30 4.17 4.20 4.40 6. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 6. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 6. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 8 4.00 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Lectur	e																
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly 2 0 1 0 3 3 3 3 3.70 1273/1466 4.06 4.33 4.32 4.32 3.70 4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 0 1 2 2 5 4.10 1065/1489 4.37 4.40 4.32 4.34 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 489/1277 4.15 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.30 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.40 554/1279 4.62 4.30 4.17 4.20 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.37 **** Self Paced 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.68 4.37 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.68 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** **Trequency Distribution** **Treque	1. Were th	ne instruc	ctor's lecture	s well	prepared	2	0	1	2	2	2	3	3.40	1406/1	488	3.99	4.39	4.47	4.47	3.40
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned 2 0 0 1 2 2 5 4.10 1065/1489 4.37 4.40 4.32 4.34 4.10 5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding 2 0 0 0 1 5 4 4.30 489/1277 4.15 3.99 4.03 4.11 4.30 Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 554/1279 4.62 4.30 4.17 4.20 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 187/878 4.47 4.19 4.05 4.09 4.60 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.37 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** ****************************	2. Did the	e instruct	tor seem inter	ested i	n the subject	2	0	0	0	1	0	9	4.80	810/1	493	4.83	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.80
Discussion Discus	3. Was led	cture mate	erial presente	d and e	explained clearly	2	0	1	0	3	3	3	3.70	1273/1	486	4.06	4.33	4.32	4.32	3.70
Discussion 1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 1 1 3 4.40 554/1279 4.62 4.30 4.17 4.20 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 187/ 878 4.47 4.19 4.05 4.09 4.60 4.80 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.37 **** Self Paced						2	0	0	1		2	5	4.10	1065/1	489	4.37	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.10
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 554/1279 4.62 4.30 4.17 4.20 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.37 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	5. Did aud	diovisual	techniques en	hance y	our understanding	2	0	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	489/1	277	4.15	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.30
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned 7 0 0 0 1 1 3 4.40 554/1279 4.62 4.30 4.17 4.20 4.40 2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.37 **** 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			Diagna	aion																
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1270 4.96 4.57 4.35 4.42 5.00 3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 187/878 4.47 4.19 4.05 4.09 4.60 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.37 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 35 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 3. 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 28-56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant	1 Did al-	aa diaan			what wou learned	7	0	Λ	Λ	1	1	2	4 40	EE//1	270	1 62	4 20	1 17	4 20	4 40
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion 7 0 0 0 0 0 5 5.00 1/1269 4.92 4.38 4.35 4.41 5.00 4. Were special techniques successful 7 0 0 0 0 0 2 3 4.60 187/878 4.47 4.19 4.05 4.09 4.60 Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.37 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.61 4.83 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 35 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant					-	7	-	-	-	_	_			,						
### - Means there are not enough A. Were special techniques successful																				
Field Work 1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.37 **** Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.83 4.89 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 35 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors O0-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant					d Open discussion															
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 11 0 1 0 0 0 0 1.00 ****/ 52 **** 5.00 4.48 4.37 ****	4. Were St	pecial tec	ciniiques succe	SSIUI		,	U	U	U	U	4	3	4.00	10//	070	4.4/	4.13	4.05	4.03	4.00
Self Paced 1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.83 4.89 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 35 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Frequency Distribution			Field	Work																
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 24 **** 5.00 4.83 4.89 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant	1. Did fie	eld experi	ience contribu	te to w	hat you learned	11	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	****/	52	****	5.00	4.48	4.37	****
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 40 **** 5.00 4.60 4.83 **** 2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 **** 24 **** 5.00 4.83 4.89 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant			Self :	Daged																
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal 11 0 0 0 0 1 0 4.00 ****/ 24 **** 5.00 4.83 4.89 **** 3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 35 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant	1 Did sel	lf-paced s			what you learned	11	Ω	Ο	Ο	Ο	1	0	4 00	****/	40	****	5 00	4 60	4 83	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful 11 0 0 0 1 0 0 3.00 ****/ 35 **** 5.00 4.67 5.00 **** Frequency Distribution Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant									-		_	0	00	****/		****				****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 F 0 Electives 0 H### - Means there are not enough responses to be significant							-		-	-	_	0		****/		***				****
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades Reasons Type Majors 00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 B 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 0 B 2 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 0 Major 4 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 84-150 1 3.00-3.49 2 D 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 0 Wajor 4 Major 5 Wajor 5 Wajor 6 Wajor 6 Wajor 7 Wajor																				
00-27 1 0.00-0.99 0 A 8 Required for Majors 0 Graduate 0 Major 4 28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant					Frequ	iency	Dist	tribu	ıtior	1										
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant	Credits Ea	arned	Cum. GPA	Expected Grades				Rea	sons	3				Тур	e			Majors	3	
28-55 3 1.00-1.99 0 B 2 56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant	00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A 8		Red	guire	ed fo	or Ma	iors	 3	0	Grad	luat.e		0	Maio	 or	4
56-83 3 2.00-2.99 1 C 0 General 2 Under-grad 12 Non-major 8 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 responses to be significant					*						. ,	-	-				-) •		-
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		-		-			Gei	nera	L				2	Unde	er-ar	ad 1	.2	Non-	major	8
Grad. 0 3.50-4.00 4 F 0 Electives 0 #### - Means there are not enough P 0 responses to be significant		-					001		_				_	01140			-	2.011		ŭ
P 0 responses to be significant							Ele	ectiv	<i>r</i> es				0	####	- N	leans t	here a	re not	enoua	rh
•		-	2.22 2.00	-	- *														_	, -
1 0 00101 10					I O		Otl	ner				1	.0						-	

? 1

Course-Section: SPAN 302 0201 University of Maryland Title ADVANCED SPANISH II

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1514

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI

Enrollment: 16 Questionnaires: 14

Student Course Evaluation Que	stionnaire
-------------------------------	------------

			Fre	equer	ncies	5		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
	0	0	0	0	0	_	0	4.64	443/1576	4.28	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.64
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	•	0	0	0	•	2	9		515/1576	3.87	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.54
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	-	-	-	0	0	8	4.57	,					
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	Τ	2	11	4.71	345/1342	4.44	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.71
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	4	10	4.71	291/1520	4.36	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.71
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	0	4	9	4.43	483/1465	4.30	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.43
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	1	0	1	5	7	4.21	727/1434	4.07	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.21
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	3	1	10	4.50	527/1547	3.63	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.50
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	9	4		1288/1574	3.45	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.31
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	2	0	0	0	3	6	3	4.00	924/1554	3.77	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
	^	0	0	0	1	4	0	4 57	706/1400	2 00	4 20	4 47	4 47	4 57
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	Τ	4	9	4.57	786/1488	3.99	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.57
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	2	12	4.86	683/1493	4.83	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.86
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	6	7	4.43	792/1486	4.06	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.43
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	9	4.64	526/1489	4.37	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.64
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	1	1	2	2	7	4.00	692/1277	4.15	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	Ο	1	Ω	11	4.83	204/1279	4.62	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.83
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	11	4.92	234/1270	4.96	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.92
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	2	10	4.83	353/1269	4.92	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.83
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	0		6	4.33	322/ 878	4.47	4.19	4.05	4.41	4.33
1. Were special techniques successiul	4	U	U	т	U	5	O	4.33	344/ 0/8	4.4/	4.19	±.05	4.09	+.33
Frequ	ency	Dist	ribu	ution	ı									

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	l Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	A	6	Required for Majors	2	Graduate	0	Major	7
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	5						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	1	C	0	General	1	Under-grad	14	Non-major	7
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	2	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	10	_			
				?	1						

Course-Section: SPAN 304 0101 University of Maryland SPAN: FOR HERITAGE SPEA Baltimore County

Title Instructor: SCHWARTZ, ANA-M Spring 2009

Enrollment: 11 Questionnaires: 9

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1515

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

	Frequencies				Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect			
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	Λ	Λ	Λ	2	7	4.78	277/1576	4.78	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.78
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	6	4.75	249/1520	4.75	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.75
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	454/1465	4.44	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.44
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	270/1434	4.67	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.67
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	624/1547	4.44	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.44
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	6	3	4.33	1262/1574	4.33	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.33
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	138/1554	4.86	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.86
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	4.44	945/1488	4.44	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.44
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	1053/1493	4.67	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.67
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	891/1486	4.33	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.33
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	1	2	0	2	2	2	3.25	1107/1277	3.25	3.99	4.03	4.11	3.25
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	194/1279	4.86	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.86
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	307/1270	4.86	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.86
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	332/1269	4.86	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.86
4. Were special techniques successful	2	1	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/ 878	5.00	4.19	4.05	4.09	5.00
Frequ	ıency	Dist	tribu	ution	n									

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

Course-Section: SPAN 307 0101 University of Maryland Title ESPANA Y SUS CULTURAS

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1516

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN Enrollment: 18 Questionnaires: 15

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

			Fre	equer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	324/1576		4.34	4.30	4.30	4.73
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	2	6	6	4.13	1049/1576	4.13	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.13
 Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals 	0	0	0	0	1	3	11	4.67	406/1342	4.67	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.67
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	8	5	4.29	826/1520	4.29	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.29
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	6	9	4.60	304/1465	4.60	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.60
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	7	7	4.40	524/1434	4.40	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.40
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	2	5	7	4.13	947/1547	4.13	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.13
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	4.73	795/1574	4.73	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.73
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	6	0	0	1	3	4	1	3.56	1285/1554	3.56	4.13	4.10	4.09	3.56
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	1	4	9	4.40	995/1488	4.40	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.40
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	14	4.93	390/1493	4.93	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.93
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	1	2	5	7	4.20	1003/1486	4.20	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.20
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	4	10	4.60	579/1489	4.60	4.40	4.32	4.34	4.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	0	1	0	5	9	4.47	347/1277	4.47	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.47
									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	625/1279	4.31	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.31
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	2	5	6	4.31	805/1270	4.31	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.31
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	1	1	4	2	5		1058/1269	3.69	4.38	4.35	4.41	3.69
4. Were special techniques successful	3	2	0	0	1	5	4	4.30	339/ 878	4.30	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.30
1. Here appeared techniques successful		2	9	9	_	5	_	1.50	337, 010	1.50	1.10	1.05	1.00	1.50

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expected	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	A	8	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	1	1.00-1.99	0	В	3						
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	1	C	1	General	1	Under-grad	15	Non-major	7
84-150	5	3.00-3.49	0	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	L
				P	0			responses to	be sign	nificant	
				I	0	Other	10				
				?	1						

Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU

Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST

Enrollment: 22

Questionnaires: 22

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1517 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Questions	NR	NA	Fre	equer 2	ncies 3	4	5	Inst Mean	ructor Rank	Course Mean	_	UMBC Mean		Sect Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	1	0	0	0	2	0	19	4.81	243/1576	4.81	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.81
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	4	16	4.71	324/1576	4.71	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.71
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	2	19	4.90	179/1342	4.90	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.90
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	1	0	0	0	7	13	4.65	348/1520	4.65	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.65
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	2	17	4.71	231/1465	4.71	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.71
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	1	0	1	0	1	6	13	4.43	498/1434	4.43	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.43
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	1	0	0	1	0	2	18	4.76	228/1547	4.76	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.76
8. How many times was class cancelled	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	235/1574	4.95	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.95
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	8	0	0	0	1	4	9	4.57	339/1554	4.57	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.57
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	124/1488	4.95	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.95
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	1	20	4.95	279/1493	4.95	4.78	4.73	4.70	4.95
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	1	2	18	4.81	271/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32	4.81
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	4	0	0	0	0	0	18	5.00	1/1489	5.00	4.40	4.32	4.34	5.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	3	0	0	0	0	3	16	4.84	121/1277	4.84	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.84
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	5	0	0	0	0	4	13	4.76	253/1279		4.30	4.17	4.20	4.76
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	6	0	0	0	0	3	13	4.81	345/1270	4.81	4.57	4.35	4.42	4.81
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	6	0	0	0	1	2	13	4.75	444/1269	4.75	4.38	4.35	4.41	4.75
4. Were special techniques successful	6	1	0	0	2	2	11	4.60	187/ 878	4.60	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.60
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.48	****
4. Did the lab instructor provide assistance	21	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 232	****	5.00	4.29	4.16	****
5. Were requirements for lab reports clearly specified	21	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 379	****	5.00	4.20	4.17	****
Seminar	0.0	0	0		0	-		4 50	****	ale ale ale ale	4 65	4 50	4 60	****
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	20	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	20	0	0	0	0	1	1		****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned 4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	20 20	0	0	0	0	1 1	1		****/ 72 ****/ 80	****	5.00 5.00	4.64 4.61	4.53 4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	17	0	0	0	0	1	4		****/ 375	***	4.97	4.01	4.12	****
5. Were Criteria for grading made clear	1/	U	U	U	U	1	4	4.00	/ 3/5		4.97	4.01	4.12	
Field Work														
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 52	****	5.00	4.48	4.37	****
2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 48	****	5.00	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 44	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	21	0	0	0	0	1	0		****/ 45	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	19	0	0	0	0	1	2	4.67	****/ 326	****	4.99	4.03	4.23	****
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	21	0	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	20	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	****/ 382	***	4.99	4.08	4.24	***

Title LATINOAMERICA Y SUS CU

Instructor: STOLLE-MCALLIST

Enrollment: 22 Questionnaires: 22 University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1517 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits E	arned	Cum. GPA		Expecte	d Grades	Reasons		Type		Majors	
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	0	 А	10	Required for Majors	0	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	4	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	3	2.00-2.99	4	С	1	General	1	Under-grad	22	Non-major	14
84-150	7	3.00-3.49	3	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	7	F	0	Electives	1	#### - Means	there	are not enough	h
				P	0			responses to	be sig	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	18	-			
				?	3						

Baltimore County

Course-Section: SPAN 311 0101

13

INTRO TO SPANISH LIT

SLOANE, ROBERT

Title

Instructor:

Enrollment:

Questionnaires: 8

University of Maryland Page 1518 JUL 2, 2009 Spring 2009 Job IRBR3029

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

					Frequencies NR NA 1 2 3 4 5					_		tructor	Course	_				
		Question	IS		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	om this course	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	471/1576	4.63	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.63
		ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	448/1576		4.32	4.27	4.28	4.63
		uestions reflec			0	0	0	0	1	1	6	4.63	-,		4.48	4.32	4.30	4.63
	_	uations reflect		1 3	0	1	0	0	0	2	5	4.71				4.25	4.25	4.71
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	4.88			4.26	4.12	4.09	4.88
	_	-		to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63				4.14	4.15	4.63
		g system clearl		-	0	0	0	0	0	3	5				4.12	4.19	4.21	
	_	was class cand			0	0	0	0	1	7	0		1526/1574		4.55	4.64	4.61	
	-			ching effectiveness	3	0	0	0	0	1	4		160/1554		4.13		4.09	4.80
	_																	
		Lectur																
		uctor's lecture			1	0	0	0	1	4	2	4.14	1181/1488	4.14	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.14
		ctor seem inter		1	0	0	0	0	0	7	5.00	1/1493		4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00	
		explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	1	6	4.86	221/1486		4.33	4.32	4.32			
	. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned						0	0	0	2		4.71	434/1489		4.40	4.32	4.34	4.71
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	2	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	132/1277	4.80	3.99	4.03	4.11	4.80
		Discus	aion															
1 Did al	acc dica			what you learned	3	0	0	0	Λ	1	4	4.80	219/1279	4.80	4 30	4.17	4.20	4.80
				ed to participate	3	0	0	0	0	1		4.80			4.57		4.42	
				nd open discussion	3	0	0	0	0	1	4		386/1269		4.38	4.35		4.80
		echniques succe		ia open arbeabbion	3	1	0	0	0	3	_	4.25	367/ 878		4.19			4.25
	_	1																
				Frequ	lency	Dist	trib	ution	ı									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA	1	Expected Grades				Rea	asons	5			ТУ	pe			Majors	3
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	1	 A 5		Red	 mir		 or Ma	ajors		 0	Graduat	 e	0	Majo		2
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	В 2		1000	4411	-u I) 1 PIC	. , 01 6		0	Graduat	_	0	11000	·±	2
56-83	1	2.00-2.99	2	C 0	General				1	Under-g	rad	8	Non-	major	6			
84-150	4	3.00-3.49	0	D 0	General								-		5	-		
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	2	F 0	Electives				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enous	rh			
	-	2.23 2.00	=	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Otl	her					7			3			

INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI

Title Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI

Enrollment: 13 Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1519 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eauer	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank		Mean	Mean		Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	457/1576	4.64	4.34	4.30	4.30	4.64
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	1	0	0	0	1	2	7	4.60	476/1576	4.60	4.32	4.27	4.28	4.60
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	369/1342	4.70	4.48	4.32	4.30	4.70
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	1	0	0	0	0	3	7	4.70	311/1520	4.70	4.30	4.25	4.25	4.70
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	9	4.73	225/1465	4.73	4.26	4.12	4.09	4.73
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	8	4.64	296/1434	4.64	4.22	4.14	4.15	4.64
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	4	2	5	4.09	978/1547	4.09	4.12	4.19	4.21	4.09
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	4.91	469/1574	4.91	4.55	4.64	4.61	4.91
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	3	0	1	0	1	2	4	4.00	924/1554	4.00	4.13	4.10	4.09	4.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	401/1488	4.80	4.39	4.47	4.47	4.80
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.70	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	271/1486	4.80	4.33	4.32	4.32	4.80
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.80	309/1489	4.80	4.40	4.32	4.34	
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	3	6	4.50	309/1277		3.99	4.03	4.11	
1									,					
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	244/1279	4.78	4.30	4.17	4.20	4.78
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	2	0	0	0	1	1	7	4.67	505/1270	4.67	4.57	4.35		4.67
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	2	0	0	0	1	0	8	4.78	421/1269	4.78	4.38	4.35	4.41	
4. Were special techniques successful	2	0	0	1	2	0	6	4.22	383/ 878	4.22	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.22
Laboratory														
1. Did the lab increase understanding of the material	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 234	****	5.00	4.23	4.24	****
2. Were you provided with adequate background information	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 240	****	5.00	4.35	4.32	****
3. Were necessary materials available for lab activities	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 229	****	5.00	4.51	4.48	****
Seminar														
1. Were assigned topics relevant to the announced theme	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 85	****	4.67	4.72	4.67	****
2. Was the instructor available for individual attention	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 79	****	4.67	4.69	4.69	****
3. Did research projects contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 72	****	5.00	4.64	4.53	****
4. Did presentations contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 80	****	5.00	4.61	4.22	****
5. Were criteria for grading made clear	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 375	****	4.97	4.01	4.12	****
Field Work	1.0	0	0	0	0	-1	0	4 00	**** / FO		F 00	4 40	4 27	****
1. Did field experience contribute to what you learned 2. Did you clearly understand your evaluation criteria	10	0	0	0	0 1	1	0		****/ 52 ****/ 48	****	5.00	4.48	4.37	****
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	10					-	-	3.00	,		5.00	4.40	3.92	****
3. Was the instructor available for consultation	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 44 ****/ 45	****	5.00	4.73	4.63	****
4. To what degree could you discuss your evaluations	10	0	0	0	1 1	0	0		,	****	5.00	4.57	4.50	****
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	10	U	U	U	Τ	U	0	3.00	****/ 326	^^^	4.99	4.03	4.23	^^^
Self Paced														
1. Did self-paced system contribute to what you learned	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 40	****	5.00	4.60	4.83	****
2. Did study questions make clear the expected goal	10	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	****/ 24	****	5.00	4.83	4.89	****
3. Were your contacts with the instructor helpful	10	0	0	0	1	0	0		****/ 35	****	5.00	4.67	5.00	****
4. Was the feedback/tutoring by proctors helpful	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 28	****	5.00	4.78	5.00	****
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	10	0	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	4.24	****

Title INTRO TO LATIN AMER LI

Instructor: SCHNEIDER, JUDI

Enrollment: 13
Questionnaires: 11

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1519 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Credits Earned		Cum. GPA	Expected	Grades	Reasons		Type	Majors			
00-27	0	0.00-0.99	0	 А	3	Required for Majors	1	Graduate	0	Major	8
28-55	3	1.00-1.99	0	В	6						
56-83	2	2.00-2.99	3	С	0	General	1	Under-grad	11	Non-major	3
84-150	3	3.00-3.49	1	D	0						
Grad.	0	3.50-4.00	4	F	1	Electives	0	#### - Means	there	are not enough	
				P	0			responses to	be si	gnificant	
				I	0	Other	8	-			
				?	0						

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

Instructor: BELL, ALAN S

Enrollment: 8 Questionnaires: 5

Spring 2009 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire Page 1520

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	1148/1576	4.00	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	996/1576	4.20	4.32	4.27	4.35	4.20
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	2.00	****/1342	****	4.48	4.32	4.46	****
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	1	1	1	1	1		1466/1520	3.00	4.30	4.25	4.38	3.00
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	2	2	4.00	850/1465	4.00	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.00
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	4.00	878/1434	4.00	4.22	4.14	4.30	4.00
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	4.40	690/1547	4.40	4.12	4.19	4.24	4.40
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	665/1574	4.80	4.55	4.64	4.69	4.80
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	3.00	1448/1554	3.00	4.13	4.10	4.24	3.00
Lecture							_	4 00		4 00				4 00
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	2	2		1233/1488	4.00	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.80	810/1493	4.80	4.78	4.73	4.80	4.80
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	Τ	3	1		1101/1486	4.00	4.33	4.32	4.41	4.00
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	Ι	Τ	2	1		1298/1489	3.60	4.40	4.32	4.38	3.60
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	0	0	Τ	0	Τ	2	1	3.40	1066/1277	3.40	3.99	4.03	4.04	3.40
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	Ω	1	2	1	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.30	4.17	4.31	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	636/1270	4.50	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion		0	0	1	1	1	1		1116/1269	3.50	4.38	4.35	4.55	3.50
4. Were special techniques successful	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	221/ 878	4.50	4.19	4.05	4.33	4.50
1. Here apectar eccumingues successivi	_	2	U	U	U	_	_	1.50	221/ 0/0	1.50	1.17	1.00	1.55	1.50

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

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

Instructor: SINNIGEN, JOHN Spring 2009

Enrollment: 3 Questionnaires: 2

Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Page 1521

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

			Fre	eque:	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1539/1576	3.00	4.34	4.30	4.46	3.00
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	1	0	1	0		1523/1576	3.00	4.32	4.27	4.35	3.00
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	4.00	972/1342		4.48	4.32	4.46	4.00
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	1	1	0		1362/1520	3.50	4.30	4.25	4.38	3.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.22	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1204/1434	3.50	4.22	4.14	4.30	3.50
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2.00	1538/1547	2.00	4.12	4.19	4.24	2.00
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.69	5.00
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1452/1488	3.00	4.39	4.47	4.55	3.00
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1330/1486	3.50	4.33	4.32	4.41	3.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3.00	1415/1489	3.00	4.40	4.32	4.38	3.00
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	1149/1277	3.00	3.99	4.03	4.04	3.00
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	445/1279	4.50	4.30	4.17	4.31	4.50
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	0	0	1	0	0	1	0		1249/1270	2.50	4.57	4.35	4.53	2.50
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	0	0	1	0	1	0	0		1259/1269	2.00	4.38	4.35	4.55	2.00
4. Were special techniques successful	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3.00	799/ 878	3.00	4.19	4.05	4.33	3.00
Frod	nonat	. Dia	t wib	1+ i o	_									
Frequ			CTID	uc10.	11									
Credits Earned Cum. GPA Expected Grades				Re	asons	3			Ty	pe			Majors	1

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

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

MEDINA, ADRIANA Spring 2009

Enrollment: 11

Questionnaires: 9 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Questions									ncies				ructor	Course	_			
		Question	S		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		 Genera	 1															
1. Did vo	ou gain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	4.89	179/1576	4.89	4.34	4.30	4.46	4.89
_	_	ctor make clear			1	0	0	0	0	3	5	4.63	448/1576		4.32	4.27	4.35	4.63
		uestions reflec			0	5	0	0	0	1	3	4.75	298/1342		4.48	4.32	4.46	4.75
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	2	2	5	4.33	768/1520	4.33	4.30	4.25	4.38	4.33
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1465	5.00	4.26	4.12	4.22	5.00
	-	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	5	4	4.44	473/1434	4.44	4.22	4.14	4.30	4.44
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	1	1	2	1	4	3.67	1276/1547	3.67	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.67
8. How ma	any times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.69	5.00
				hing effectiveness	2	0	0	0	1	3	3	4.29	682/1554	4.29	4.13	4.10	4.24	4.29
	Lecture																	
1 Were t	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	2	1	5	4 30	1018/1488	4.38	4.39	4.47	4.55	4.38
	2. Did the instructor's rectures well prepared						0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00
	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject 3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly						0	0		4		4.33	,		4.33	4.32	4.41	
		es contribute t		1	0	0	0	0	2	2		4.33		4.33	4.40	4.32		4.33
				our understanding	0	0	1	0	3	0		3.89	812/1277			4.03		3.89
1 5 1 1		Discus			0	0	0	_	•	0	•	F 00	1 /1000	F 00	4 20	4 1 1	4 21	F 00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5.00	1/1279	5.00	4.30	4.17	4.31	5.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	0	9		1/1270	5.00	4.57	4.35	4.53	5.00
		ctor encourage echniques succe		d open discussion	0	1	1	0	0	0	9 7	5.00 4.50	1/1269 221/ 878	5.00 4.50	4.38	4.35	4.55	5.00 4.50
4. were s	special to	ecnniques succe	SSIUI		U	Τ	1	U	U	U	/	4.50	221/ 8/8	4.50	4.19	4.05	4.33	4.50
				Frequ	iency	/ Dis	trib	utio	n									
Credits E	Earned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Re	asons	5			Ту	pe			Majors	\$
															1			
	00-27 2 0.00-0.99 0 A 6 28-55 1 1.00-1.99 0 B 2					Red	quir	ea i	or Ma	ajors	3	U	Graduat	е	1	Majo	r	2
28-55	28-55					a	nera	1				2	The day		0	Mar		7
	-			9 0		Gei	nera.	Т				3	Under-g	LaU	8	NON-	-major	/
84-150 3 3.00-3.49 1 D 0 Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					TO 7	ecti					0	инии -	Moona +	howo -	nc+		-h	
Grad. 1 3.50-4.00 3 F 0					上16	ectl	ves				U	#### - 1 respons				_	ìII	
P 0 I 0					O+1	hor					6	respons	es to L	e sign	ıııcan	ıL		
				Ι υ	Other							O						

Page 1522

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Course-Section: SPAN 601 0101 University of Maryland Title STUDIES IN SPANISH LAN

Baltimore County Spring 2009

Page 1523

JUL 2, 2009

Job IRBR3029

Enrollment: 2 Questionnaires: 2 Student Course Evaluation Questionnaire

Instructor:

BELL, ALAN S

Questions						373		_	ncies		_		tructor	Course	_	-	Level	
		Question	S 		NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
		Genera	 1															
1 Did vo	nı dain n	ew insights,ski	_	m this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	Ω	3 50	1445/1576	3.50	4.34	4.30	4.43	3.50
_	_	ctor make clear			0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	608/1576		4.32	4.27	4.32	4.50
		uestions reflec			0	1	0	0	0	0	1		1/1342		4.48	4.32	4.38	5.00
		uations reflect			0	0	0	0	0	0	2		1/1520		4.30	4.25	4.36	5.00
				what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1				4.26	4.12	4.25	4.50
	-	_		o what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4.50	398/1434	4.50	4.22	4.14	4.35	4.50
7. Was th	ne gradin	g system clearl	y expla	ined	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1347/1547	3.50	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.50
8. How ma	ny times	was class canc	elled		0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How wo	9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectivenes						0	0	1	1	0	3.50	1303/1554	3.50	4.13	4.10	4.18	3.50
	Lecture																	
	1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared						0	0	0	1	1	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.50
2. Did th	2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject						0	0	0	0	1	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was le	ecture ma	terial presente	d and e	xplained clearly	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3.00	1421/1486	3.00	4.33	4.32	4.37	3.00
4. Did th	ne lectur	es contribute t	o what	you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4.00	1118/1489	4.00	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.00
5. Did au	diovisua	l techniques en	hance y	our understanding	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1.00	1274/1277	1.00	3.99	4.03	4.08	1.00
		Discus	gion															
1 Did cl	ass disc			what you learned	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	3 00	1186/1279	3.00	4.30	4.17	4.34	3.00
				d to participate	0	0	0	0	0	1	1				4.57	4.35	4.53	4.50
				d open discussion	0	0	0	0	0	2	0		928/1269		4.38	4.35	4.55	4.00
		echniques succe			0	1	1	0	0	0	0		877/ 878		4.19	4.05		1.00
	-	-																
				Frequ	ency	Dist	trib	ution	n									
Credits E	Carned	Cum. GPA		Expected Grades				Rea	asons	3			Ту	pe			Majors	3
00-27	1	0.00-0.99	 0	A 1		Rec	nuire	 ed fo	 or Ma	 ajors		0	Graduat	 e	1	Majo	 r	0
28-55	0	1.00-1.99	0	B 1		1000	2411	- a - L	J_ 1710	. ,		J	Gradac	_	_	1100	-	J
56-83	0	2.00-2.99	0	C 0		Ger	nera:	l				1	Under-g	rad	1	Non-	major	2
84-150	0	3.00-3.49	1	D 0		001		_				_	22202 3		_		, 0 -	_
Grad.	1	3.50-4.00	0	F 0		Ele	ectiv	ves				0	#### - 1	Means t	here a	re not	enone	rh
	_	2.22 2.00	-	P 0								-	respons				_	,
				I O		Oth	her					1			5		-	
					Otner													

Course-Section: SPAN 621 0101 Universitie STUDIES IN HISPANIC LI Ba

uctor: SINNIGEN, JOHN

Instructor: SINN Enrollment: 6
Questionnaires: 6

University of Maryland Baltimore County Spring 2009 Page 1524 JUL 2, 2009 Job IRBR3029

			Fre	equei	ncies	3		Inst	ructor	Course	Dept	UMBC	Level	Sect
Questions	NR	NA	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	Rank	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
General														
1. Did you gain new insights, skills from this course	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	637/1576	4.50	4.34	4.30	4.43	4.50
2. Did the instructor make clear the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	392/1576	4.67	4.32	4.27	4.32	4.67
3. Did the exam questions reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	583/1342	4.50	4.48	4.32	4.38	4.50
4. Did other evaluations reflect the expected goals	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	511/1520	4.50	4.30	4.25	4.36	4.50
5. Did assigned readings contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	366/1465	4.50	4.26	4.12	4.25	4.50
6. Did written assignments contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	4.33	594/1434	4.33	4.22	4.14	4.35	4.33
7. Was the grading system clearly explained	0	0	1	0	1	1	3	3.83	1196/1547	3.83	4.12	4.19	4.24	3.83
8. How many times was class cancelled	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1574	5.00	4.55	4.64	4.75	5.00
9. How would you grade the overall teaching effectiveness	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	4.50	395/1554	4.50	4.13	4.10	4.18	4.50
Lecture														
1. Were the instructor's lectures well prepared	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	4.50	870/1488	4.50	4.39	4.47	4.52	4.50
2. Did the instructor seem interested in the subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5.00	1/1493	5.00	4.78	4.73	4.80	5.00
3. Was lecture material presented and explained clearly	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	4.50	678/1486	4.50	4.33	4.32	4.37	4.50
4. Did the lectures contribute to what you learned	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	4.67	500/1489	4.67	4.40	4.32	4.38	4.67
5. Did audiovisual techniques enhance your understanding	1	0	0	1	2	0	2	3.60	974/1277	3.60	3.99	4.03	4.08	3.60
Discussion														
1. Did class discussions contribute to what you learned	1	0	0	0	2	1	2	4.00	802/1279	4.00	4.30	4.17	4.34	4.00
2. Were all students actively encouraged to participate	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	4.20	855/1270	4.20	4.57	4.35	4.53	4.20
3. Did the instructor encourage fair and open discussion	1	0	0	1	1	1	2	3.80	1018/1269	3.80	4.38	4.35	4.55	3.80
4. Were special techniques successful	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	3.80	603/ 878	3.80	4.19	4.05	4.11	3.80
Field Work														
5. Did conferences help you carry out field activities	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 326	***	4.99	4.03	4.10	****
Self Paced														
5. Were there enough proctors for all the students	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.00	****/ 382	****	4.99	4.08	4.13	****
Frequ	ency	Dist	cribu	ution	n									

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